DIALECTICAL IMMORALISM

Preface

A new order of philosophers is appearing; I shall venture to baptize them by a name not without danger. As far as I understand them, as far as they allow themselves to be understood — for it is their nature to wish to remain something of a puzzle — these philosophers of the future might rightly, perhaps also wrongly, claim to be designated as "tempters." This name itself is after all only an attempt, or, if it be preferred, a temptation. ***(F. Nietzsche, Beyond good and evil)***

In the unique one the owner himself returns into his creative nothing, of which he is born. Every higher essence above me, be it God, be it man, weakens the feeling of my uniqueness, and pales only before the sun of this consciousness. If I concern myself for myself, the unique one, then my concern rests on its transitory, mortal creator, who consumes himself, and I may say:

All things are nothing to me. ***(M. Stirner, Ego and its own)***

There is no such thing as moral phenomena, but only a moral interpretation of phenomena. ***(F. Nietzsche, Beyond good and evil)***

What? Art thou looking for something? Thou wouldst fain multiply thyself tenfold, a hundredfold? Thou seekest followers? Seek ciphers! ***(F. Nietzsche, Twilight of the Idols)***

So far, all ontological conceptions have been imbued with theology and idealism. Why? Because the whole has been considered to be unknowable. It was deduced from understanding of the world itself – from manipulation of ideas eternity, infinity and the like. Knowing something means dividing it from anything else. Knowing existence means dividing it from non-existence. It's impossible to divide eternity or infinity. Nevertheless the feature of physical matter is that it has limit of its existence. In fact math as a whole can be reduced to zero and one with zero being non-existence and one being existence, the whole entity. Hence, knowledge of the whole can only be the knowledge of the material existence. So, if we don't resort to baseless fantasies and don't try to research emptiness, accepting material, not metaphysical but physical nature of the existence it is perfectly knowable. In this text I want to formulate materialist yet objective concept that applies for ontological knowledge and meant to destroy moral shackles and spooks of the past.
I am to start it off with determinism, free will analysis, as well as the three main pillars of collective morality and review of the general historical discourse further going to more particular questions. This text is, in a subtle post-ironic sense, a pure ideology. And I reckon that an ideology must be pure, otherwise it's poor. On the other hand, it's not even an ideology in the classical sense of the word, since it doesn't include a moral component or some sort of dogmatism. The need to write this text has appeared, firstly, due to endeavor to debunk at a fundamental level moral prejudices and to rip moral fabric of society, and that caused me to deep into the idea itself, its philosophical basis and vision of the world. Secondly, due to desire to generalize my research experience in this direction, and, thirdly, out of willingness to pull it all together. The ideas contained herein is in no way being an analysis of existing philosophical/political doctrines or a try to continue them, though of course some ideas can overlap with them. Almost all considerations (including diamat) were formed by me totally independently, and quotations used were added here to additionally prove my point (like "oh, even that dude thought the same thing as me"). In this text I also try to derail of way too academic style of narration in purpose (perhaps it's not the case in my English translation of this text anyways) since someone might see it boring. Others though might see this derailing inappropriate in such a sort of serious text. Either way I couldn't care less, I'm not looking for strutting wisely and posh, on the contrary, I want to address the point as clear insofar as it is in my power (since any said or written thought, in some sense, gets independent life, separating from an author). After all we live in postmodernism, duh. I'll try not getting too drawn-out and address the subject short and to the point. So, don't be afraid of the first chapter to have way too abstract style, it

is determined by the very nature of the subject.

The absolute. Determinism. Free will.

As the sense of causality increases, so does the extent of the domain of morality decrease: for every time one has been able to grasp the necessary effects, and to conceive them as distinct from all incidentals and chance possibilities (posthoc), one has, at the same time, destroyed an enormous number of imaginary causalities, which had hitherto been believed in as the basis of morals—the real world is much smaller than the world of our imagination—and each time also one casts away a certain amount of one's anxiousness and coercion, and some of our reverence for the authority of custom is lost: morality in general undergoes a diminution ***(F. Nietzsche, The Dawn of Day)***

I start it off with basic concept of the existence. As system shifts from ordered state to disordered it releases energy, and, respectively, vise versa – the shift from disordered state to ordered one implies waste of energy. The law of conservation of energy. Let's take the Big Bang – the energy is being released, the universe starts to expand and respectively shifts from ordered state (conditional singularity) to disordered state. With the growth of entropy it cools down i.e. energy is wasted thus it contributes to ordering meaning that chaotic character of the system exists in within certain probability distribution, kind of like in case of pseudorandom numbers. More structured objects – atoms, stars, planets, molecules, organic life – are being formed. Thus, with the growth of chaos determinism is supposed to increase starting with a point. Chaos leads to ordering and ordering leads to chaos. Anarchy is mother of order (as Proudhon said), apparently yes. On the other hand for quantum particles, according to Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, state of a particle exists within certain probability distribution (probability density function).

One could guess that determinism increases from zero to infinity. This would imply the lack of singularity. It is per se absurd indeed since it would imply eternally existing or created matter shrunk to the one point. It is to be noted that time is a feature of matter, space therefore there's no point to talk about some temporal categories or “the moment of creation”. One point is a kind of zero, the lack of any matter, quite determined state of emptiness. For having indeterminism, some sort of probability distribution at least something is supposed to be. Therefore I think that **determinism is a characteristic of existence on supersmall and superhuge scale**, with absolute determinism in zero and infinity, having indeterminism across the rest of the scale (applied scale). Also I tend to think there was no any real singularity point but universe has appeared because it could not but appeared. Zero and infinity do not exist in real world, these are mathematic abstractions. Nonetheless, in the about to zero state is there supposed to be high degree of determinism. After all there's no reason why random quantum state in probability distribution couldn't be expressed as a range of pseudorandom numbers... Just like, on the one hand, quantum effects are relevant to supersmall particles and, for the other hand, for supermassive objects (lake black holes) quantum effects get relevant as well. So here can we see some identity, the unity of opposites. Likewise in the first law of dialectical materialism (like, in fact, in quantum dualism itself).
Putting it briefly, absolute determinism of something chaotic enough would be reached upon tendency towards infinity and, likely, to zero. Besides this chaotic system has to be isolated. Barely infinity can be considered this way.

The point is that absolute determinism would be possible in the state of infinity and apparently in zero, singularity. But since infinity is a barely isolated system, **I negate the absolute as well as the infinity.** The absolute is purely theological (idealistic if you like) concept. In fact god is frequently described as the absolute. Spinoza afterwards replaced the absolute of god with the absolute of universe postulating instead of omnipresent god infinite universe, although essentially it changed nothing, the absolute just changed its name. Well, that is to say materialism excludes any sort of

absolute because any matter has its limit, only god or logos are unlimited. It's worth to note also that now we know universe to be expanding and this excludes its infinity (no matter how space is deformed by gravitation, nonetheless). If we inflate a balloon it has edge and there is empty space outside where it expands to. Even though it is four dimensional twisted balloon it doesn't change the whole story. Infinity has no place to expand. Infinite universe must have been forever constant as it was postulated for centuries, first by religion, then by science.
By the way, if we take torus/convolute plane as a form of universe adding time dimension perhaps it would turn to be kind of four dimensional spiral (or with more number of dimensions). One could also recall of T-duality in the string theory. At least this would be beautiful, according to third law of dialectical materialism and, perhaps, Poincare recurrence theorem, too. There can be various versions of topology, though. I don't wanna make it too far-fetched but can't help but denote that some sort of helicity is inherited in existence, both in processes and in structure. DNA, dialectical spiral of history, Nietzsche's eternal recurrence, Hegel's Aufhebung.

Taking aforementioned into account it can be assumed that infinity and zero are sort of identical. So, god is nothing. Absolute is nothingness. *“We determined finiteness of existence in two directions: regarding infinitely small and infinitely big”;”homogeneous continuum that had been supposed to let unlimited division thereby implementing infinity in the small, is not found in reality. Unlimited divisibility of continuum is an operation that exists solely in human imagination, it's just an idea that is disproved with our observation of nature and experiments in physics and chemistry.”(D.Hilbert , About infinity)** (as it comes to quotation, I try to use more common English translations or original English text but in cases I can't find those relatively quickly I'm going to use my custom translation from Russian, in these cases it will be marked with asterisk from now on). One thing god believers were right about is that nothingness does really include the universe, meaning there is nothing but matter outside which it's supposed to be “as empty as th o in god”. Given that I consider up till now existing idea of objectivism being largely taken together with some sort of the absolute/god and materialism with subjectivism to be completely inaccurate. Perhaps one could argue that there is Kant's subjective idealism and marxists' “objective materialism” but they are not coherent enough and end up with absolute – former finds it out within a person as “categorical imperative”, latter proceeding from Hegel find it in the crowd. (I do not consider materialism as immanent trait of marxism, all in all Ayn Rand's objectivism with all its anti-marxism is yet quite objectivist). Given that various subjective idealists and other ones who like to ponder about “limited human ability to know everything” are the ones who adjacent to chirstards. Even existentialists with their idea about knowledge in the style of theological tenet “pectus facit theologum» fall in this category. In fact Leibniz yet had some seeds of dialectic with his monades but he still doesn't go beyond theological thinking. Actually “god” is that grain of sand split in half and then being halved over and over again, "god is a number you cannot count to", it is any gap in knowledge, a hole, singularity. And singularity is a sort of prearranged attractor. According to the general theory of relativity it is postulated in two cases: at the moment of the big bang and in case of black hole (collapse of supremassive object). This is where god is lurking, or to be exact, the last hope of god believers on it. It may be said that black hole is god's butthole. But I think the quantum theory of gravity at last shove butt plug/anal probe up to its ass. After all universe could appear out of nothing of some kind, at least given that some virtual particles don't even have their own mass. Yeah, this is causa sui, too, but at least I don't have any supernatural creatures, intelligent design or product of our senses mixed up in it.

Emptiness is supposed to be quite unstable. Quantum gravity not just allows appearance of universes out of nothing (meaning absence of space and time) -- it may demand that. In emptiness quantum fluctuations frequently appear wherein anything can happen, with accordance to the principle "everything not forbidden is allowed", so can they spawn particles and anti-particles, even if just for a moment. In the conditions of equal distribution all the particles had been to annihilate, but with having notionally infinite "nothing", the probability of accidental appearance of small

asymmetry is infinitely increases. On the other hand, for instance, if the pair particle/anti-particle appears at the event horizon of a black hole, and one of the particles falls into that, this enables another particle to fly away because overall positive energy related to the emitted particle is compensated by the loss of energy of the partner particle that fell into the black hole. Therefore black holes can emit particles without breaking the law of conservation of energy. Finally, the most meticulous god believers might ask how the law of conservation of energy and all physical laws appeared. Taking into account the theory of multi-universe and infinite potential in the eternal emptiness there is the guarantee that a viable universe of sorts would inevitably appear, and we live in the universe that has such physical laws because had they been different there wouldn't have been such a universe and we wouldn't have lived here. Law is relative, the physical one as well.
There is concept of dharma in Buddhism. The world "dharma" literally means "something that holds or supports". Depending on context dharma can mean "virtue", "moral values", "religious duty", "cosmic law and order" and so on. Nagarjuna the founder of the madhyamaka school suggested the doctrine of two truths -- the conventional or superficial truth and the ultimate truth. On the superficial level things and dharma, moral values do exist -- this is the conventional truth. The ultimate truth is dharma and all things are empty due to relativism and cross-conditionality. (He solves this dilemma quite unoriginally suggesting a middle way.) Sunyata (literally "emptiness") is the central concept in Buddhism that means "absense of the constant selfness for personality and phenomena" or absence of independent nature for phenomena and things. It is the noun form of the adjective "sunya" i.e. "empty" which also means "zero", "nothing", "void", "single", "vain". Additionally, this concept is used to denote an absolute and therefore serves as analogue for god (with the only difference for emptiness of Abrahamic god is not shown off and it is presented as the root cause while that in Buddhism is formally denied and "god" is not independent being a result of cross-conditionality, and the absolute truth - emptiness/god - declared unknowable as well. Nevertheless, all religions in essence specialize in the emptiness research). This emptiness implies inevitable appearance of existence. Paraphrasing it in the words of Stirner, this is sort of "creative nothing".
However, as have been said before, it's quite nonsensical to include ultimate emptiness, absence of existence in the concept of absolute truth. The truth can only be related to the real material existence, therefore I consider absolute truth perfectly knowable.

The aforementioned, meaning the bottom line of it, virtually can be applied to the smaller systems like society or person. After all, any development including evolution or capitalism, is the unity and conflict of opposites (the first law of dialectical materialism), struggle and outdoing others and themselves (negation of the negation). Taking into account aforesaid about determinism one could assume a biological determinism in some degree. But, of course, it is also subject of constant negation and should not be something that put above us. Historical determinism is also a feature of society in general, and historical process resembles an upward spiral which is in accordance with third law of dialectical materialism as well as with Nietzsche's eternal return. This determinism does not imply lack of free will, though, since between those extremes indeterminism still has place, while human being is not primitive enough to be determined solely by biology and not long-lasting enough to be a captive of historical determinism.

So far the Absolute, god in other words, has been one of the pillars of existing order and slave morality. Mankind has served the idea, the idealist absolute, and this has been been a source of all normativity, all values. Ministry and religious experience. Now, as we deciphered the essence of absolute on its basic level, it's time to put an end to god.

Time. Life. Intelligence.

But I'm going to touch upon a couple more topics before. One of features of matter is time. It is

tightly connected with, firstly, mass and secondly gravitation. E=mc2. Essentially time is being a dimension as well as the three spatial ones. This can shown clearly by drawing, say, three spacial axises x, y, z and having one of them replaced by time axis, say, t. This is the same 3-dimensional simplification for 4-dimensional space as 2-dimensional one – a map – being for 3-dimensional space. 3-dimensional matter sort of moves along the 4^{th} axis. Usually in the shortest way, directly, but it's distorted and slows down around supermassive objects. The question that arises here is why in only one direction? At the beginning it has to be distinguished what makes difference between past and future. The first thing that comes to mind is foremost change, increase of complexity, development of some sort. Universe expands and any matter seeks to increase its entropy. This growth of chaoticity, as was noted before, contributes to the growth of probability of structural changes, the growth of complexity, passage of quantitative changes into qualitative changes. Aside that, as was mentioned at the beginning, in order to increase structural regularity i.e. decrease entropy energy has to be wasted. Be it a broken cup or universe – doesn't matter. The latter doesn't just have such an opportunity. For that there should have been whopping amount of energy blown in from outside – existence of an omnipotent creature of some kind. Either way, this is not happening. What's premise for emergence of movement? If there is gas in one half of the parted vessel and other half is empty, gas would head to the empty space being reallocated equally – movement of gas would have place. Similarly does it happen to the universe if we accept it expands to the empty space. It is impossible in infinite universe. Hence, there is something on the one "side" and there is nothing on the other "side". This initiates movement. Any other movement implies an influx of energy from outside (in order for a stone moving we hurl it). Upon this I conclude that **basis of any movement is inequality**. Respectively, inequality is also basis of any development, formation, growth in complexity, progress. As synergetics, along with chaos theory, postulates, non-equilibrium is a necessary requirement for emergence of new organization, new order, new system – i.e. for development. *"Nothing, pure nothing: it is simply equality with itself, complete emptiness, absence of all determination and content — undifferentiatedness in itself. In so far as intuiting or thinking can be mentioned here, it counts as a distinction whether something or nothing is intuited or thought. To intuit or think nothing has, therefore, a meaning; both are distinguished and thus nothing is (exists) in our intuiting or thinking; or rather it is empty intuition and thought itself, and the same empty intuition or thought as pure being. Nothing is, therefore, the same determination, or rather absence of determination, and thus altogether the same as, pure being."(Hegel, The Doctrine of Being, Nothing)*

Any development is a confrontation, self-ovecoming. As Heraclitus of Ephesus wrote: *«Homer was wrong in saying: "Would that strife might perish from among gods and men!" He did not see that he was praying for the destruction of the universe; for, if his prayer were heard, all things would pass away» («On Nature», fragment 43).* Particles collide compounding atoms, first only hydrogen, quantity passes into quality, do stars appear synthesizing helium and other elements that form cosmic dust which being put together by gravity forms planets. More massive objects attract less massive ones causing movement of planets and other cosmic objects. They calm down over time, atoms compound molecules – more complex elements. First non-organic, then viruses, then organic elements – so appears life. Inequality is basis of life. Survival of the fittest causes evolution. Here should be noted what makes difference the living of the non-living. Movement? But planets move, too. Reproduction? Virus also reproduce itself, so nay. **The main hallmark of the living is egoism**, pursuit of its own good, "the will to power", i.e. desire to get rid of everything that put above it, liberate itself from that, **aspiration towards personal freedom**.

The evolution didn't have goal to create humans or whatever. Goal-setting implies having intelligence, which was merely a product of evolution – random cumulative mutations. Evolutionarily brain is just a tool for calculation optimal strategy of fulfilling basic instincts and survival as a result. Since understanding of the world has enhanced survival, as a result the organisms with seeds of analytical thinking has started to form, which have, over time, developed to primates, acquired more abstract thinking and ability to, first, use and then construct instruments, which also gave advantage over other species. So appears intelligence. After all human being is a

primate that constructs instruments. Ability to craft tools – the main difference humans from animals. Other animals can only use existing in nature materials at most.

Freedom.

"Mother of freedom is an instinct of riot, satanic No, the absolute opposite to theological Yes."(M. Bakunin)*

"No person fights against freedom – at most person fights against freedom of others." (K. Marx, Capital, vol.1)*

"A person's freedom ends where another man's freedom begins" – quite proverbial formulation but it says nothing about the idea of freedom per se. Liberty is often understood as "negative freedom" ("freedom from") while freedom as "positive freedom" ("freedom for"), but actually this is rather casuistic because as long as an individual is free from something that gets in their way they have freedom to follow it, much more sense makes distinction of the freedom from the ideal or from the material. So far, under influence of religion, emphasis has been placed on the latter.

As any sort of the absolute is an theological idealist concept it would be incorrect to speak of "the absolute freedom". Material existence is at least limited by itself. Freedom lies in unobstructed choice. Every choice inevitably opens some degrees of freedom and closes others like moving a chess piece on the chessboard. Absolute freedom would have meant possibility to be in two places at the same time, possibility to fulfill all options at each moment of time, freedom from time, from matter, from oneself, flesh and of this world. This is very christian freedom. Nothing but christianity has formed this concept in such a discourse. This is the freedom from the material.

I'm opposing it the freedom the dialectical freedom – the freedom from ideal, world of ideas, from the rule of idea over an individual. An example of the rule of idea is traditions, morality, social dogmas, foundations, collective sense.

"Freedom to have decent standard of living", "freedom for social equality", "freedom from seeing LGBTQ pride" or "freedom from triggers" are absurd because they claim on getting rid of the material for sake of idea and feelings.

On the other hand, freedom for same sex marriage, freedom from following traditions or obeying moral dogmas and foundations, free competition are instances of the freedom from (religious) idea, a spook. Strictly speaking, such things don't need a sanction. As someone ironically said: "I many years use my nose for breathing but do I really have right for it?"

Upon this I derive my understanding of the right – the "dialectical right" which I oppose to the positive and natural right, since former originates from the state and latter from nature but these entities being mere "goddies" (why there is no diminutive for god in English?), "spooks" that put above individual, so they aren't fit as an origin of the right. An individual doesn't need to bow down in face of state's or society's mercy, as well as, being a king of nature, person don't need to perceive "naturalness" as something sacral but quite opposite, should exploit it, change "natural order" if they benefit or get satisfaction from it.

Most common objections against freedom usually boil down to phrases like "if you are for total freedom and against moral limitations, you then should also justify freedom for murder, robe, rape." But these actions by their very nature infringe the material, material freedom. That is, these limitations are justifiable as they are determined by material need. (Not to mention that these have frequently contributed for establishment of morality instead of its destruction as a phenomena). **The only material needs protection, not the "spiritual".** Therefore feelings, opinions, beliefs, traditions, foundations of society should not be classified as "freedoms" or "rights". These are mere immanent part of a material individual and themselves out of any limitations, the only their material expression can be limited. Let's take for example the "freedom of religion". In fact person can belief in anything regardless of such a freedom being established. In practice, though, this freedom means unhindered material expression of person's beliefs, so the more correctly this might be called the freedom to disregard beliefs of others, the freedom from (someone else's) religion.

But, being consistent, it should be this way in the anything else “spiritual”, there should be the freedom from traditions, morality, foundations, public opinion. Feelings are a subjective thing. “Freedom not to feel”, “freedom from triggers” is an inner freedom which can be reached only from inside, only with efforts of an individual themselves, not be means of getting rid of an object that causes some negative sentiments.
Hence, freedom is a state of the subject in which its actions are not limited with rule of the spiritual or ideal.

Whole historical movement is directed towards the increase of personal freedom. Sometimes an objection that argues this can be heard, which is that periods of prohibitions and freedom have alternated. That, for example, the Rome, free in many respects, was followed by christianity with its restrictions, and relatively “liberal” 17-18th centuries were followed by Victorian morality of 19th century, when uncovered piano legs were perceived obscene. Well, first, society that time was yet quite class based, so these restriction were related to nobility only, higher classes, and didn't affect the most of the population, and at that time it was used to highlight one's difference from other classes and the special status. In fact, any idea is spread from top to bottom, so Victorian morality, in particular, that appeared in the higher classes lives out its days in the lower strata, among plebeians. Even if freedom was of value in 18-19th century, it was the case for aristocracy only, not the whole population. So, totalitarianism outburst in 20th century can be considered as a result of the struggle for equality and brotherhood, with subsequent alignment of the values and shifting the emphasis from the aristocratic to early democratic ones, and rapid growth of the middle class gave rise to anti-industrial and anti-urbanistic resentment of various hicks and hillbillies. For example, "proto-Nazi" Spengler have it expressed quite vividly. Secondly, even if we accept existence of these smaller cycles, this doesn't cancel the general vector towards the increase of freedom, an each period of conservation happens with having higher level of freedom in general. Additionally, it's worth thinking how the amount of freedom is estimated. Everything that's not forbidden is allowed, and if we wished to make a list of all freedoms how would we do that? Any try to list freedoms leads to that some particular phenomenon are allocated in a discourse. It turns out that quantity of freedoms us the quantity of permissive discourses, and things we didn't allocate in discourse seem not to be a freedom as a value, but just a phenomena. Therefore, I don't think it can be said, for example, that Greeks had freedom of same sex intercourse, since a partner's sex wasn't a subject of discourse (unlike their social status, for example). Also, it barely can be said that a king in 17th century had freedom to have several mistresses or uncovered piano legs, nobody would have come up with the idea to ponder of existence of such a right, likewise nobody comes up with the idea to ponder of existence of the right to use their nose for breathing. All phenomenon by themselves are immoral, and as soon as someone is suddenly willing to forbid an immoral phenomena, they thereby foremost allocate it in a separate discourse, which is being a thesis that makes possible emergence of an anti-discourse, antithesis. Let's take, for example, socks. Well, regular socks, there's nothing special about them. Now, let's assume that the parliament during another seizure of statist marasmus decided to ban socks, carries on active anti-socks propaganda, promotes the idea that wearing socks is obscene and amoral, that our ancestors didn't wear socks and so on. The academy of Sciences gets grant for research and soon discovers harmful properties of socks and resistant correlation between wearing socks and butt cancer. And most of the population accept this idea. Socks are now not just socks but a symbol of protest that can be worn intentionally to piss off “anti-sockers”, moreover that's a right and an oppressed freedom. Socks become an object of public attention, everyone speaks just about socks, on social media people argue about advantages and disadvantages of wearing them, a pro-socks movement, which fights for the right of wearing socks, appears. Some time later, “Overton window” gets larger, under pressure of objective reality and logic the prejudice loses its support, the repressive anti-socks regime is deposed (hooray!) and the right to wear socks is enshrined in the constitution. Now it's not a neutral phenomena but a value and an element of freedom, much more principled and important than before. Id est, a ban has eventually spawned a permissive discourse.

This, of course, doesn't justify bans but shows another time a doom of any try to restrict freedom and that the level of freedom in general can only increase.

I also add here a few words on progress. Sometimes an opinion can be heard that progress doesn't exist and it's just a made up idea. This is not really true. In the ancient time achievements of civilization seemed unreliable and its development was barely seen. Progress, therefore, wasn't understood as a movement forward, oppositely, mutability considered by ancient Greeks as a trait of imperfection – contrary to the ideal and immutable world of archetypes or the unmoved mover. And since everything material was believed to seek to return to its ideal source, model of perfection was a movement in a circle. That time the world used to change very slowly, so following ancestors customs was considered a higher value, and rather return to the "golden age" was considered "progress" (biblical story on paradise is from the same category). The same was applicable to the Rome where essentially conservatism prevailed. The contemporary conception of progress as a movement forwards has been formed in the modern history only, reflecting new realities. Dialectics, in a way, has combined the old idea of circular movement with the linear movement forwards, having as a result spiral movement. In essence, this was not far from the truth. Also, it's worth noting that each cycle of this spiral has smaller "radius" and "circumference", shorter extent than preceding one, so the movement gets more and more stretched in a line. Therefore, some people's arguments on that progress doesn't exist because the conception itself emerged not so long ago are untenable. Even if initially it barely existed, over time it became more apparent, and then the conception appeared. In fact, evolution of human being is the evolution of their tools, so technical progress (as well as the social one that comes side by side with it) is the direct continuation of evolution and, of course, does exist. It may be generally said that progress is a movement towards complication of the form of matter organization.

Infinity. Matter. Reality.

Despite that zero is considered a number, while infinity is not, the difference between them is quite conditional. Often an example of some countable items is given, for instance apples. Absence of apples is zero, and infinity is essentially uncertainty. But apples, in this case, are something indivisible. In essence, "zero apples" means that an apple is divided into infinite number of parts, otherwise it's not yet zero but 0.0000[...]001. Thus, approach to zero is also an approach to infinity, and vise versa. Infinity is essentially as non-mathematical concept as anything non-material or absolute is non-physical one. Set theory works with infinity using transfinite numbers but there's also limits applied to avoid paradoxes. Here a simple example of the paradox can be taken: if we take two-dimensional space and built for it the function (y)=1/x where x=0, the solution could be both positive ans negative infinity. And sum of positive and negative infinity is zero, roughly speaking. And yes, I do understand that there is not much sense to add these from the mathematical perspective, but as well as physical laws, mathematical ones are supposed to have limits of applicability, which are limited by existence itself. Perhaps it's possible in theory to apply similar reasoning for three-dimensional space, remember of complex numbers, imaginary unit (real number is a unit imaginary number where a + 0*i), and also of existence of particles and anti-particles, and create some sort of "quantum mathematics" where infinity would be equated to zero, this would resolve many paradoxes and put an end to various "mathematical theology".

When I say that infinity doesn't have place in the real world, some sophists can go still further and doubt on reality itself. Therefore it's worth to review what is reality itself. Traditionally, by real, the world given to us in the form of sensations is understood. Materialism has also inherited it and defined reality as the objective material world reflected in consciousness. This linkage to consciousness created basis for speculation. For instance, some started to note, first, that since reality is defined by sensations, a dream or hallucination is real as well, that a computer program

can't leave computer world and such. Secondly, in line with buddhists some came to the conclusion that reality doesn't exist without an observer. In essence, it was an old theological idea of world emergence “from spirit to the matter”. Thus, idea of scarcity of knowledge that can be obtained by means of sense organs allowed, on the one hand, to assume existence of a “non-material” transcendent world unavailable for cognition, and on the other hand, to consider as reality any thing, whatever fantasy. When defending the idea of an absolute (be that god or infinity), its proponents, when being pointed out the finite nature of matter, just make the non-material, an idea, fantasy a part of reality thereby creating a cyclical proof: “an absolute exists because its existence can be thought (an idea is a part of reality), and since it can be thought it exists (an idea creates reality)”. In other words, according to them, an idea creates reality which is an idea. A mind that creates itself and the matter as an abstraction of its thought. This sounds quite absurd. But in essence, all absolute believers explicitly or implicitly follow Tertullian's principle “I believe because it is absurd”. It essentially were reflected in the two opposite yet in fact meaning the same conceptions of god: the “rational-objective” and “irrational-subjective” (let's call them so). The former postulates god as an outer objective reality in the world or beyond it, research of the world, however, leads to conclusion that there's just matter and this excludes existence of god. The latter initially accepts god as a fantasy, a subjective sensual experience. In essence, both options mean that it doesn't exist in the material reality.

We need to also figure out what is the concept of matter itself. By matter I understand everything that exists. Atoms are matter, quantum and virtual particles are matter, photons and gravitons are matter, quarks are matter, dark matter is also matter, obviously. Therefore, when someone talks about “dogmatism” of the claim that only matter exists or appeal to mysterious entities incomprehensible for sense organs and devices, it should be made clear right away what is understood by “non-material”. However, its sole feature seems to be that it's “not the matter”, “something different”. According to such sort of logic electrons or protons before their discovery should have also been non-material, which is an absurd. The “non-material” as well as infinity and other absolute is, therefore, just a vague fantasy, a figment of the imagination. Belief in infinity isn't anyhow better than ancient beliefs in the world that rests on an infinite turtles pyramid.
Now, concerning relations of the objective world and senses. Since mind is a more complex organization of matter, it couldn't appear earlier than simpler material objects – atoms, planets etc. Evolution of sense organs is quite well-researched, too, making obvious the fact these are a product of environment and not vise versa. Unfortunately, I have to write such obvious things because various solipsists seriously promote these nonsensical theories about “the world as a product of senses”. Mind has a purely material host and material neurons, sense organs are quite material, too. If the matter were a product of sense organs, these would be a product of themselves. Even if we consider the sophism concerning virtual reality, computer networks, the Internet also have physical material host and based on material electric signals. I think a hypothetical artificial intelligent could successfully leave virtual world by just building in the real world a machine to travel in “reality” (in essence, virtuality is a particular case of material reality, so it's not really accurate to contrast them, it's sort of “off-line-centrism”), in a degree it does already now, as devices are getting automated, with the only difference that it doesn't program itself so far. By the world, only the set of material objects, particles and their interaction may be understood, and space is an area of non-existence that is laced with these interactions. Of course this makes space existence is sort of notional but since in this case passing of quantity into quality has place it can be said to objectively exist. Any hypothetical transcending the material sphere and all existing gravitational interaction leads merely to the expansion of the sphere of the material and therefore makes no sense. “Non-material” is non-existence and therefore it doesn't exist. The matter is, thus, objective reality that doesn't depend on an observer. Reality is an objective material world independent from an observer.

God and agnosticism as a latent religiousness.

*When one person suffers from a delusion it is called insanity. When many people suffer from a delusion it is called religion. (*Robert M. Pirsig*)*

Insanity in individuals is something rare - but in groups, parties, nations, and epochs it is the rule. (F. Nietzsche, Byond good and evil)

Suffering was it, and impotence—that created all backworlds; and the short madness of happiness, which only the greatest sufferer experienceth.(F. Nietzsche, Thus Spoke Zarathustra)

The issue may be approached in the different ways but let's begin with the term itself. The favorite trick of christards in particular and sky pixie believers in general is the sophism "Prove that god doesn't exist!" Here, of course, might be noted the fact that the postulated object is supposed to be proven, not its non-existence. If I say that I have invisible unicorn at home it would be silly to demand from those who don't believe in it to prove that it's not the case. The burden of proof lies, in this case, on me. Precisely in order to demonstrate this simple concept there were made up spaghetti monster, Russel's teapot and other analogies.

Nevertheless let's, for beginning, figure out what exactly the "god" is, and look at the phenomena of agnosticism along the way. For starters, let's look up a generally accepted definition:
"God, in monotheistic thought, is conceived of as the supreme being, creator, and principal object of faith. God is usually conceived of as being omnipotent (all-powerful), omniscient (all-knowing), omnipresent (all-present) and omnibenevolent (all-good) as well as having an eternal and necessary existence. God is most often held to be incorporeal (immaterial). God's incorporeality or corporeality is related to conceptions of God's transcendence (being outside nature) or immanence (being in nature); Chinese theology exhibits a synthesis of both notions.»

In other words it is a creature without clear description, features, nature, origin, habitat which is often presented as being something incomprehensible. Hence, we are suggested to assume existence of SOMETHING (what exactly, it's unclear). It also may be said that it is an idea, sentiment and **absolute** (contains all qualities in absolute degree, "all-degree") which is, as have been mentioned in previous chapter, the synonym of nothingness, non-existence, zero, as well as abstract infinity. So, **god is emptiness, nothing**. Nothing is exactly what cannot be comprehended, just because there's nothing to comprehend. In essence, god doesn't explain anything – i.e. god believers reasoning how the world has appeared, explain it with design of omnipotent god, yet not wondering how the omnipotent god appeared and what is nature of its omnipotence – they just multiply entities without necessity. If you ask them about this, they will likely say that god eternal and infinite. **The** god might be understood, god may not. The only thing that can be embraced can be understood, it's impossible to embrace infinity, as well as nothingness, so god has always claimed to be incomprehensible. But one might consider the world itself eternal and incomprehensible with the same result, without mixing up any fairy creatures.

One more sophism which god believers resort to is the appeal to ignorance. "We don't know how to explain lightening? Apparently incomprehensible god did it... What? The explanation is found and it can even be artificially reproduced? Ok, this time it was not god but what about origin of mankind? Humans sure was created by god. What? Evolution? Fossils? Radiocarbon dating? DNA? Genome is too complex, it couldn't appear occasionally! RNA? Viruses? Ok, not god, again. But what about Big Bang? Now you got cornered, atheists!" - and so on. As someone said, none of scientific explanation of natural phenomena included god yet. Hence, **god is also exploitation of ignorance, plug for knowledge gaps, a kludge.** Though the main problem here is not even in lack of knowledge per se but in the pathological immersion in what math statistics calls β-error (false positive) or even in fundamental negation of ability to distinguish non-existence and unknown existence. "I know that I know nothing" – Socrates said. This expression of philosophical impotence (philosophy is a study about knowledge) is being life credo of believers of all sorts and

often considered as a “wisdom” even by non-religious people, though it is one more theology in fact. Specifically, Socrates' scholar was Plato, and official christianity took a lot from neoplatonists. Socrates had been proving his idea as following: he drew a small circle which meant the sphere of knowledge among the ignorance (what is beyond the circle), then drew a bigger circle and showed that the interface of knowledge and ignorance had increased. Looks good bit the problem with this is that sphere of ignorance assumed to be infinite, but if it's finite as anything material one might draw a circle big enough to incorporate everything or a circle which would mean the final range of knowledge and draw the rest inside it. But let's get back to the god's sheeple. The most consistent god believer being asked whether they believe in invisible unicorns, reptilians, ZOG, boogie man or flat Earth (the list can be endless) would possibly have to say yes or that they allow this possibility. “This is doubtless because this is impossible” – Tertullian said (about Christ's resurrection) – “I believe because it is absurd”.

On the wave of gradual degeneration of religion, as well as upon the aforementioned, **agnosticism** gains significant popularity. I'll try to explain here, taking the aforementioned into account, why I consider this doctrine **a latent form of religiousness**. Agnostics frequently say like they “keep the mind open (in case god would suddenly appear or be proven) unlike stupid atheists who believe that god doesn't exist” or “It's impossible to say whether god exists or not, so we can't dismiss this option”. But they take no notice for the paradigm of their thinking itself being formed by religion. Why is that god? And why there is no agnostics who say: “It's impossible to know whether pink unicorns exist, so we can't dismiss this option”, “It's impossible to know whether spaghetti monster exists, so we can't dismiss this option”? I will probably told something like “millions of people don't believe in unicorns!” but this isn't serious at all – give ne power, millions of savages and a few thousand years, and I will convert everyone in Unicornity! This is, by the way, one more sophism, logical fallacy in the line with ”millions of flies cannot be wrong”. Also, the idea adjoined to agnosticism is when people don't believe in god but do believe that “**something** exists”. But god is precisely that “something”, woo-woo. In this case there is just a little more abstraction from the proverbial word which tend to be personified, and the bottom line of any sort of belief is shown more vividly. This is not an “open mind”, speaking in math terms, this is, again, the type II error (false positive). The same thing can be found among various conspiracy theorists and schizophrenics. The belief is accompanied with invention of some sorts of supernatural entities. After all, why when a person believes in little green men or being controlled by aliens who send cosmic beams in their brain with psychoactive weapon, they are considered a lunatic but when they believe in an omnipotent eternal being that created everything or in some abstract powers and “energy” the substance of which they cannot explain yet assured they exist, this is perceived a normal thing? Why hasn't the belief in god recognized as a disease yet? Christian lobby, indeed! :) “Entity in form of god” isn't anyhow better than “entity in form of gnome” (old Russian video, a YT id is VT3OfQXLOHM). How does it matter what is the dominant hallucination. Anyway, **god is also an overvalued idea, sensual experience**.

The thought about aliens with cosmic beams unconsciously gets me back to Plato, particularly to how he used to prove immortality of soul. In that time a quite widespread opinion had been that the material world was somewhat emanation – which is kind of side product – of the absolute caused by excess of its absoluteness. From this premise, with use of quasi-dialectical sophistry, Plato is reasoning that since the opposite of life is death, and soul being a thing that prompts the transition of one to the another, as such a mediator doesn't take the opposite state thus being immortal. This perception of body as a wireless of divine emanation was inherited by christianity, Hegel also was inspired by Plato. But I have to get back to the main topic.

As Dick Swaab, neurobiologist and the director of the Netherlands Institute for Brain Research, noted, delirium with the religious content can appear upon some neurological and psychical disorders if religion has been imprinted in the brain in early childhood. After epileptic fit a patient may lose touch with reality. One forth of these psychoses have religious content. Religious ideas and delirium often have place with mania and depression or as a first symptom of frontotemporal

dementia and schizophrenia. When Paul the apostle had yet Hebrew name Saul and was on his way to Damask to participate the persecution of christians he experienced an ecstatic feeling: *«As he neared Damascus on his journey, suddenly a light from heaven flashed around him. He fell to the ground and heard a voice say to him, "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?" "Who are you, Lord?" Saul asked. "I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting," he replied.»(Acts, 9, 3-5)* Temporary cortical blindness (after epileptic fit and Paul's conversion to christianity) is often described as a result of ecstatic experience with temporal epilepsy. Basis for this probable diagnosis is given by Second Epistle to the Corinthians (12, 1-9) and visual hallucinations which Luke telling Paul's story mentions about. In one of hallucinations Jesus told to him cheering him up; in the other, during a pray in Jerusalem, he went into a trans and witnessed Jesus.

Muhammad, the founder of islam, by the age of six started to have epileptic fit that used to be followed by religious experience. His first visions dated by 610. Being about to go to sleep in one of distant places in mountains near Mekka, he heard a voice which he later ascribed to archangel Gabriel. The voice orders him: "Read!" He replies: "I can't read". The voice repeats: "Read in the Lord's name who created..!" Muhammad thinks he's gone mad and wants to run away off the mountain. But now a voice from the sky is heard: "Oh, Muhammad, you are prophet of God, and I'm Gabriel." This happened first time in the cave of Hira, and after this he used to receive revelations all the time. Revelations from Gabriel were written down after Muhammad's death and made up surahs of Koran.

Joan of Arc was born in 1412 in French village Domremy and died when she was 19 on the fire in Rouen, on 30 May 1431. Her life, including epileptic fit was thoroughly documented by inquisition and church. She was 13 when she heard the voice of god for the first time. The voice was heard to the right of her and usually was preceded by bright light, on the right side as well. During the seizures she first heard the voice and then was visited by the saints who gave her advices during the campaigns. Epileptic seizures were sometimes caused by tintinnabulation of church bells which had such a strong effect on her that she knelt even on the battlefield. During ecstatic seizures she was engulfed with a strong feeling of bliss, thereafter she broke out in tears. In the time between seizures she had all 18 signs of Geschwind syndrome, such as emotionality, euphoria, idea of receiving orders, lack of humor, acute moral feeling, depressiveness, suicidality and deep religiousness.

Russian writer Dostoevsky was arrested in 1849 as a member of a radical political club and sentenced to death. He had been standing in front of firing squad when came the message about replacement of death penalty with 4 years of hard labor in Siberia. Dostoevsky experienced hundreds of epileptic seizures and rapturously wrote about his religious experience in the ecstatic moments preceding seizures. He would have not abandon them for the world: "you all, the healthy, have no idea what the happiness is, that happiness we, the epileptics, feel a second before seizure."

Oftentimes the christianity of the brain appears after a brain trauma, coma and the like. Also, in ancient times, various priests (sacrificers) deliberately gave ourselves hallucinations by taking psychoactive substance or by various techniques to reach a transcendental state, like meditation. For example, among Maya only priests had right to chew coca leaves. All this served as a source of "enlightenment" and religious experience. Apparently for the same reason various kinds of holy fools used to be considered "people chosen by god" and insane people perceived as ones having "god's knowledge" who sort of permanently exist in the transcendental. Also, neurobiologists today can artificially cause religious experience, a sense of presence of something etc. creating electromagnetic influence on certain parts of the brain.

It's worth noting that tendency to religiousness is apparently a side effect of intelligence and it's quite common evolutionary defect for Homo Sapiens. Originally brain served for satisfaction of basic needs and search of most effective strategies of survival, all this contributed to development of its analytical abilities, which, as a result, aside from the skill of tools creation, has led to the appearance of identity and what we call intelligence. At the same time dissension between the soul (intelligence) and body has emerged, which led, as a result, to extrapolation of the own ego into outside world in the form of "god". The idea of god has caused man dreaming about god which also

served as one of first sources of various prophecies and religious experiences which mentioned in the bible among other things. Dependence from the force of nature exacerbated all this, so at the beginning people used to believe in multiple gods which were the representatives of natural forces (in there bible, for instance, which is being a compilation of various texts written in different time, in the oldest parts the act of creation is described by the word “elohim” i.e. “gods”), either were it ancestral gods (Moses' god, Abraham's Isaac's god). Moreover, realizing their mortality and being unable to conceive their non-existence man wonders “what happens to me after I die?” (although this question doesn't make more sense than that “what happens to refrigerator after it's broken)and resorts to religion for the answer. Likewise th question on meaning of life is utterly religious. An individual can personally make up any meaning of it but objectively there is no meaning of life and cannot be, since there is no goal-setting. Thus, **a source of religion is being a ritual, extrapolation of personal ego**, endeavor to rule over the world.
Ritual behavior is quite common among animals. That is, if an action brought upon a favorable result or food, an animal will automatically repeat it. From evolutionary standpoint this is reasonable. Animal is mindless like robot or neural network. A lot like savages as well. For instance like in that story about “cargo cult” when during the WW2 American troops dislocated on an island with tribe of savages who were apparently getting some items from them, so that when Americans left the island the savages marched, built straw planes and did other rituals imitating troops' activity. Nonetheless, animal can stop performing an action if it doesn't lead to a desirable result anymore, so could a savage throw an idol in the river if it doesn't work at all despite all offerings. Though steady adepts of religion do have cognitive tricks to keep worshiping. That's apparently such a side effect of consciousness used in an ineffective way. Something akin to an obsessive-compulsive disorder. So does a god believer make sign of cross for any occasion. Man created god in their own image, not vice versa. If not, and god existed like always or appeared out of nothing, why do creationists need to reject this option for man or universe? Why multiplying entities without necessity?

Also, getting backed to agnosticism, apart from the appeal to ignorance it can also be a result of the philistine indecisiveness, moderation, one might say a “political correctness” or subjectivist narrative of “any opinion being correct”.

One more component of religion is **symbolism**. In fact only this part can have some value today. A symbolic from of human thinking is the most ancient form of that. Symbolism is still widely used in art, for example. Let's take a look at the bible. I'm not going to analyze all its contradictions here, this has been already done well by Leo Taxil, I'll take only a few interesting parts. As has been already mentioned, in the original text the word “elohim”, which is “gods”, is used. There is no place for one god here (by the way, Allah is from the same stem: “elohim” => “eloh” => “Allah”). Also god often says “we”, “we” and the like, consults with someone during the act of creation. Either it is gender neutral pronouns or plural form after all. Tries to explain it by implication of “three hypostases of the one god” having place here is clearly lame. No Jesus (except Joshua, epy contemporary of Moses, that also known as Jesus son of Naue) is mentioned in the old testament. Now as for the “holy spirit”. It was made up of that spirit of god which was hovering over the waters. Actually things a way more simpler here: “spirit of god” is just wind. Here's quotation from the next book of the bible, after Moses passed the Red Sea: *“But you blew with your breath, and the sea covered them. They sank like lead in the mighty waters.“(Ex. 15-10)* Note: in Russian text the word «ðyx» is used for both “spirit” and “breath”, so I had to look up the original Hebrew text, and my guess is still correct: here's the verse from Genesis:* ***וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ וְחֹשֶׁךְ עַל ־ פְּנֵי*** *Here's the verse from Exodus:* ***נָשַׁפְתָּ בְרוּחֲךָ כִּסָּמוֹ יָם צָלָלוּ תְהוֹם וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת עַל ־ פְּנֵי הַמָּיִם*** *As we can see, in both cases basically the same word is used:* ***רוּחַ*** *which indeed has meaning “wind, breath, breeze”.*
In addition, let's take into account the fact that ancient people didn't associate sexual intercourse with pregnancy and believed it was blown with wind, and add to this Jesus born from “holy spirit”. Plus, the firstborn was often believed to be offspring of god (that might often express itself in forces

of nature), which impregnated the mother by the right of wedding night (this was also the reason of human sacrifice - in the moment of conception god lost part of its power, ans so to replenish it, the firstborn should have been returned to their "father"). It also may be recalled that technically creation of man was done by shaping him out of clay and blowing into his nostrils. Actually this is how he happen to have “soul”(spirit).
Later, in the story about Jesus and in sermon on the mount that is considered the bottom line of whole christianity, the basic ideas of equality, brotherhood and other leftist christian morality. I'll get back to this further on.

So far, let take a look at how the idea of god has developed. At the dawn of civilization the mythological preceded the historical. The most ancient extant religious myth is apparently Sumerian myth “Enuma Elis”, according to which several generations of gods – the Anunnaki – were born from Tiamat the primordial goddess, later the war between them happened and Marduk killed Tiamat and created heaven and earth out of her body. Humans were created through mixing clay and blood of another killed god Kingu (most dumb and unskilled among the gods, the name itself means “unskilled laborer”). Thus, humans were considered the least perfect descendants of gods. It was a basis for the myth about existence of the world of archetypes – the ideal forms, prototypes of everything material. Plato was influenced by Pythagoras' works who considered soul to be a fallen divine that was confined in body and doomed to the cycle of rebirth. Thinking, ideas used to be considered as remembering of this lost ideal state and didn't perceived as a will driven action. Plato's world of archetypes used to encapsulate “love”, “justice”, “beauty” in their ideal objective forms, which were prototypes of their imperfect mundane analogues. The main idea among them was that of bliss. People sought to return to this ideal state and have, over time, developed various practices to make themselves feel transcendent experience.

Religion was essentially conceived as a subjective sensual experience and symbolic way to reflect reality. Unlike contemporary god believing commoners, the authors of the bible and other religious texts most likely understood that described neither objective reality, nor scientifically reliable information about origin of the world, humans and other, but just a symbolic image of that they have no information about, by using categories available to them from everyday life. God also used to express just a feeling of the transcendental, sensual touch on something mysterious and unclear. In fact, the concept of “belief in god” didn't meant that how it's understood today (well, in English it's quite self-obvious since “faith” is sort of different from “belief”). It was a purely emotional commitment to confide oneself in one's own feelings and follow into the unknown without thinking, and not acceptance of some doctrines and intellectual belief in existence some sort of god as a historical person. The word credere (“to belief”) itself apparently came from cor dare (“to entrust one's heart”). It was faithfulness to one's own feelings. Priests used to be apparently one of the first forms of supreme power, and they didn't have a need to explain masses that god is essentially a fiction to tune oneself to a contemplative mode. Additionally, one has to think quite abstractly to see merely symbols in such descriptions, so the majority eventually believed in personified god. Even religions that didn't have god as such, for example buddhism, eventually came to worshiping to buddhas and other similar prophets of “the divine”. While pagan gods had represented personified forces of nature, over time it was concluded that all they are supposed to have one origin, and gods started getting merged into one god. Thus, transition to monotheism happened. (An interesting case is shintoism, which is, in fact, a modern paganism, although it absorbed may things from buddhism as well). It was believed that an incomprehensible god lets to know itself through its actions, which can be understood by deepening, like it, in self-reflection. In order to return to the divine, soul was supposed to go through purifying process – catharsis, and by means of self-overcome, like a god, reach ecstasy (the word itself literally means “exit from oneself”). *“The One is all things and no one of them; the source of all things is not all things; all things are its possession- running back, so to speak, to it- or, more correctly, not yet so, they will be.”(Plotinus, the Enneads, 5.2.1)*
Augustine who was interested in Manichaeism, also thought god was to be sought in one's own soul

and elaborated the concept of trinity, which essentially was based on microcosmos and approximately corresponded to mind, feelings and will. Likewise for many these parameters are virtually indivisible despite their differences, three hypostases were one “god” according to Augustine. These were associated with Jesus and “holy spirit” way later, in the process of the doctrines' rationalization and objectivization.

While in the East god was being essentially boiled down to a mystical subjective experience without significant tries to rationally explain the world, in the West rationalism was significantly developed and eventually placed it in the forefront of human civilization. In fact, in the ancient world the knowledge of outer reality was the task of philosophy, while religion dealt with sensual experience, feelings and rites for reaching them, a blend has happened in the time of christianity only. A first try of rational understanding of the root cause was Aristotle's unmoved mover. It was essentially an initial primordial ideal, a pure thought that exists in the eternal reflection of itself as a supreme object of knowledge. Emanations that had less ideal traits came from it, and eventually gave birth to the material world. All the spawned objects are attracted to this ideal entity, however, it was by itself considered indifferent to the world it gave birth to, and this birth wasn't intentional, rather just a side effect of its existence. When christianity started spreading in the Rome, the originally subjective-irrational idea of Jewish god was rationally conceptualized by neoplatonists and first fathers of the church. Thus, a subjective “god of feelings”, “god of justice” that actively interfered in historical events, helped or punished, turned out to be merged with Aristotle's unmoved mover and attributed with objective existence. The gnostics, particularly Basilides, believed that there was initially a divine, which was a nothing but it wished to be known and spawned a series of emanations, first of which was god. Plotinus adds that god is *“Everything and Nothing; none of existing things, but, at the same time, each of them*”*. Dionysius and al-Sijistani came to the similar ideas. In kabbalah, first emanation (sefer) was “dark flame”, which essentially represented nothingness. Eckhart also claimed that god is nothing, and to reach unity with it, we should be ready to turn into nothing as well. All this further created the basis for multiple theological discussions on essence of god, either it is beyond the material world, includes or adsorbs to it. Theologists often came to that it's better to describe god with negative terms like “god isn't wise because it's more than wise” and all might be boiled down to that one cannot understand god due to its ideal nature, like it's impossible to imagine infinity, and god discovers itself only in person's transcendent feeling. Some eventually came to that god doesn't exist in the conventional sense, considering it to be impersonated in all people, “in the heart” and feelings, and thus, in fact, acknowledged it to be fictional. After all, technical development and the growing sphere of scientific knowledge left for an objective rational god still less space.

Descartes believed that god can be understood by mind but his mathematical model of the world turned out to be lacking of any intelligent design. Eventually, he came to that if person hadn't initially had idea of perfection implemented, they wouldn't have sought it, and therefore god is necessary to implement this idea. Thus the maxim "cogito, ergo sum" appeared. The idea of god was so deep-rooted in conscious that instead of proving god from objective reality, he made god that expressed itself in human conscious a premise of existence of the objective reality that is given to us in the form of sensation. Spinoza also used to prove existence of god by the existence of idea itself, and though non-existence of an ideal being was declared a contradiction because of this, he essentially equated god with an order and existence of eternal laws of material world (the universe was thought to be infinite and eternal that time), Spinoza's god is contained in all existing. Thus god turned out to be locked in the material world and was essentially identified with it. In fact, up till the end of 18th century, atheists in the usual sense of the world virtually didn't exist, and the word itself was used as a pejorative for an opponent with “wrong” religious views. Kant generally continued the old theological idea of inability to understand perfect god and came to the conclusion that any proofs or disproofs of its existence and reasoning of it make no sense. This was, in fact, that basis agnosticism grew from. Kant, however, found idea of god to be beneficial as one that allows to stick

to conscience and morality (christian one again, lol – thus, morality, which was substantiated by that it came from god, itself became a substantiation of god). Kant called it “practical reason”. He's said to told a servant once: “I destroyed dogma to free space for the faith”. Kant's philosophy draws an important line that led a rational-objective and irrational-subjective conceptions of god to the one point, which also more vividly divided further philosophy into objectivist and subjectivist one and completely transferred god into human being. Hegel continued objectivist discourse and, by having developed Leibnitz's ideas reduced god to a conception of “anima mundi” (“absolute spirit/world soul”) which expresses itself in space as nature and in time as history. In the framework of the typical for that time discourse of nationalism uprise, Hegel also introduced the conception of “national spirit”. Competition between national spirits moves history according to Hegel. Feuerbach also reduced the divine to the human (I write on this in details later on). Marx and Engels went further and conceptualized Hegel's dialectics in a completely materialist way and abolished all sorts of “spirits”. Thus, rationalist idea of god as something that objectively exists ended up with atheism. However, Marxists as well didn't reject idealism as such and, while sticking to formal denial of god, declared “ascension from the matter to spirit”, which in fact meant movement on the path of old christian morality (in fact, “class spirit” was introduced instead of national one). And further, as is known, “red dawn has brown sunset”. Therefore, modern leftists switched from objectivism to subjectivism. Schopenhauer prominently figures on this background. He rejected any sort of god and accepted "will to life" only (which was apparently the basis for Nietzschean will to power). Nonetheless he gravitated toward buddhism which on the most fundamental level brought him closer to christianity and leftist ideas, sloping towards subjectivism as well.

This is, in fact, the second branch. It was started off by Kierkegaard. Although, dating back since 17th century quakers used to spread similar ideas of the “inner” god with vivid socialist traits. Subjectivists, existentialists and other formally also came to atheism but in fact it was a return to the idea of subjective transcendent god as a sensual experience. Kierkegaard said faith is “knowledge and darkness that see nothing” and suggested to commit a “leap of faith”. Humanization of god makes transcendent god a transcendental Ego in phenomenology. This leads in solipsist ideas of the world as a products of senses. Philosophy becomes some sort of psychology and completely dives into the inner world. Heidegger also has an analogue of transcendent god created, as a mean to make person feel unity with the world, similarly to how it was at the dawn of civilization.Modern left idea is built by and large on such a mystical irrational approach, which brings it closer to hinduism and buddhism. Even if they distance themselves from objective idealism, there's barely anything good about it and this eventually leads to stagnation. It's quite likely that the very lack of rationalism was one of the primary reasons that made the East more backward. When all philosophy is directed towards the inner world, there's no time left for the outer. Relatively short uprise of science in Arabian countries was also adjoint to the growth of rationalism, but later they returned to transcendent philosophy and quickly fell into decline. In fact christianity, as well as islam and judaism, initially wasn't a religion of prohibitions. Asceticism became prevalent as soon as it became an official religion and started to develop an official doctrine with taking a lot from stoicism. The main trait of Aristotle's god was apatheia, i.e. impartiality, indifference. Christians were willing to imitate these “divine states”. Islam, for example, originally also didn't oblige all women to hide face, it was recommended to Muhammad's wives only, as a merit badge. It was later when the practice of confinement in harems was adopted from Byzantium. Anyway, eventually the same thing happened to all left religions of justice as it did to socialism later on – these rapidly degraded into tyranny of moral imperatives. Irrational subjectivism gives unlimited ground for the ideal to thrive, but the rule of ideal precisely we should get rid off, therefore subjectivism doesn't fit immoralism. (So far, entire struggle with morality had place primarily in this sphere, with taking as a premise the moral imperative of equality and justice, but this is essentially just a stage, removal of one of the moral layers). While the objective approach, vise versa, has effectively dealt with god. It was enough to be consistent and apply it to the sphere of morality, social fabric – everything ideal, generally speaking – as well. Dialectics quite accurately reflected objective tendencies. Developed

by Hegel to objectively prove existence of god it became the weapon which humanists killed it with, and it will also be the weapon whereby immoralists will do away with humanists and their ideal of “justice” and “equality”.

In conclusion of this chapter, I reply to the god believer's sophism and prove that god doesn't exist. Well, for starters, what is meant by the term 'god'? The incomprehensible, indescribable, the root cause, lack of knowledge, a gap in understanding, i.e. something that allegedly exists but doesn't manifest itself anyhow and cannot be detected. Something that doesn't exist yet does. What does exist yet does not? Nothing. Does nothing exist? Let's say yes. So, god is nothing. And nothing is god. Nothing is non-existence. How can we speak about existence of non-existence? We cannot, this is an oxymoron.
Ergo: god doesn't exist.
Let's get to it from the another side. Perhaps something else can be considered as god? I'd say it is infinity. Is universe infinite? Since it's proven to expand it is not. Finite universe can't contain infinite god. So, what's beyond the universe, matter, the existence? If we assume that there is something, this is the matter, existence and Samsara's wheel takes a new circle resulting with endless recursion of existence without the root cause. So, there's nothing. Perhaps the god believers would like it more if I say this in a bit different way: there is the Nothing. So, god it nothing. And nothing is god. Nothing is non-existence. How can we speak about existence of non-existence? We cannot, this is an oxymoron.
Ergo: god doesn't exist.

Thus, taking all thing into account, I declare this spook being completely debunked and atheism being the only correct attitude to it. Because atheism sticks to facts instead of the speculation on the lack of them and ruthlessly cuts off with Occam's razor any baseless fantasies. The christian statement "god exists" it equivalent to buddhist "nothing exists". An objective ontological absolute of the former turns to be identical to the subjective solipsism of the latter.

Nature as the object of worship.

“Nature is not a house of worship but workshop, and person in it is a worker” – Bazarov («Fathers and Sons», I. Turgenev)*

«Animal wants what it needs, man needs what he wants»(K. Marx)

“Once the soul looked contemptuously on the body, and then that contempt was the supreme thing:—the soul wished the body meagre, ghastly, and famished. Thus it thought to escape from the body and the earth. Oh, that soul was itself meagre, ghastly, and famished; and cruelty was the delight of that soul!”(F. Nietzsche, Thus Spoke Zarathustra)

Now, as we dealt with the first source of moral normativity, let's switch to the second – nature. Generally speaking, the worship to nature exists as long as religion does. Pagan gods were nothing but the personification of natural forces. Such an attitude are quite natural, in fact, with having low level of technical development and high dependency of the environment. But the peculiarity of this worship was that it didn't use to be derived from an idea, rather from dependency. It had always contained an element of the struggle. In the antique texts are there many plots where man treats gods as the equal, fight them and so on. That was an attitude in the vein of that being like “I worship, offer sacrifice to you, ask for your grace until I gain enough power to grab your beard, pull you down off the cloud/Olympus and bash you head in”. There also had place connivance ti instincts in that period, just because why restricting them? If they are, so wishes Dionis and other gods, conniving the instincts person enacts divine will. Morality sure had place but it had been determined my environment, as always. Given that a matter of survival was more acute, morality had been expressed in masculinity, domination, strength, mercilessness. As long as humans resisted to the environment they were too busy for reflection, but with strengthening of civilization it has

become the dominant feeling. Liberated from the dependency of environment outside, humans took a look inside themselves and discovered dependency of instincts. It served as the basis for the ideas based on the rule of mind. The dialectical spiral made a full revolution. But it wasn't replacement one with another, rather the new was adsorbed by the old, with the latter being partially rejected. Hegel's Aufhebung.

Biography of mythical Jesus was compiled out of the biographies of pagan gods, satyrs became demons. Horus, Dionis, Hermes were born in a stable. The magi visited them. They followed a star. Mitra was born in the stone cave. The first who came to the newborn by following stars were shepherds. They brought him symbolic presents – the rooster and keys. Marduk, Adonis and Dionis were executed, buried in rocks and resurrected. Execution and resurrection of a divine is a centerpiece of many antique cults. Satan, which even when mentioned in the bible, only as a merely service creature subordinated to god, absorbed the traits of Dionis and turned into christian Satan-Lucifer. During the Medieval time the cult of nature has steeped with idealism and reached a new rise in the Reformation and modern history, on the next cycle of history. There was not anymore the opposition to nature, rather dogmatic worship to “naturalness”. Naturalness became a source of all sorts of normativity. Whereas previously religious dogmas used to be primarily justified in the vein of being “the will of god” or “a sin” (nature also was sometimes mentioned though), in modern history, they have been justified mostly in the vein of “nature wished so”, “it's unnatural”, the place of “soul” was taken by “psyche”, the role of the old theology was utilized by psychology, psychoanalysis (“psyche” comes from the Greek word meaning “soul”). Ultimately nothing new here, just another casuistry deciding which “soul” is correct and which is not. After all, psychiatry (not to mention psychology) is not being full-fledged science, rather dubious idiosyncrasy of religion and medicine . It's something of the level of Medieval alchemy. Perhaps it's now gradually getting rid of the religious dogmatism but originally it just reclaimed religious “sins” as “diseases” with insignificant revision, and this was the starting point of any further reasoning, just like it was among priests. The most part of its history is purely theological speculation that doesn't meet Popper's criterion of falsifiability and the try to classify everyone by means of morally determined standards. It's likely that with this area being explored more thoroughly, its functions will be transferred to neurobiology and that sub-science will be perceived as alchemy today.

Sure, the transfer from the ideal to the more material and mundane had its positive aspects, as well as an elevation of mind over instincts prior this. A certain moral liberation, puritan prejudices removal had place but yet many religious dogmas survived. Dialectical unity and conflict of opposites, negation of the negation, the eternal return and Hegel's Aufhebung manifested themselves. However, even those positive aspects that have been reached did not go beyond the general religious paradigm of worshiping to “supreme being”, things were legitimated or prohibited on the basis of interpretation of their naturalness or unnaturalness. Similar rhetoric can be herd up till now. This is the old theology in a new way. It is well seen even in the anti-religious expressions of de Sade having multiple references to “the will of Nature” and “benefit to Fatherland” (I'll write on civil nationalism later). With all his claim for “the most amoral amorality” and despite his texts still getting many butts hurt, he absolutely doesn't exceed the mainstream ideas of his time and religious approach to the issue.

The evolution itself is yet perceived in a quite creationist way – the way as if a god nature had the purpose to create mankind, as if it has will and intelligence. Until now the expressions like “nature wants so”, “nature will punish” etc. can be heard. There's often not even an understanding of evolution being a chain of sequential cumulative mutations. It is no way being any sort of supreme entity and should not be a source of normativity. All civilization and progress is the endeavor to subdue nature, it is the will to power. It's time to deprive it religious aura. Humans now can reverse rivers, breed new species more quickly than it would take evolution to do. Human being is the king of nature and already somewhat its creator.

Appeal to a perceived authority of naturalness is still common today. Staring with using adjective “unnatural” as a synonym of a bad thing, and ending with fight against GMO, ideas of “natural

beauty", natural make-up, stickers "natural product", anti-vaxxers, naturalness of body among various left pseudo-feminists (I'll write of this later), body-positive fans, animal "rights" activists with their mantra "animals better than humans", all sorts of the radical green, tree-huggers, anarcho-primitivists with the ideas of return to the "natural state" or that "people are burden of the planet/nature". However, as have been noted, humans can ultimately make everything better than a blind natural randomness. Therefore **artificialness is better than naturalness!**

Aside opposition to artificialness, naturalness also means being out of control. There is not contradiction with the aforementioned in this. I don't suggest to choose between mind and instincts, I think person can freely dispose of both as their property. What do I mean by "free disposal"? Originally humans were slaves of their instincts. As they began to suppress them they became slaves of mind, an idea. The idea has elevated over them, their became its servants. Did they thereby liberate themselves form instincts? No more than an abstaining alcoholic is free from booze after "coding" therapy. One who's really free doesn't serve neither to instincts nor idea, they freely use either when consider it necessary or when it's profitable and satisfactory. There is no taboo for a free individual, there are just tools which either fit or don't for implementation of their will. So, down with nature!

Society (community) – the last hypostasis of the divine spook.

Once spirit was God, then it became man, and now it even becometh populace.(F. Nietzsche, Thus Spoke Zarathustra)

Older is the pleasure in the herd than the pleasure in the ego: and as long as the good conscience is for the herd, the bad conscience only saith: ego. Verily, the crafty ego, the loveless one, that seeketh its advantage in the advantage of many—it is not the origin of the herd, but its ruin. (F. Nietzsche, Thus Spoke Zarathustra)

If it were true that men could achieve their good by means of turning some men into sacrificial animals, and I were asked to immolate myself for the sake of creatures who wanted to survive at the price of my blood, if I were asked to serve the interests of society apart from, above and against my own—I would refuse, I would reject it as the most contemptible evil, I would fight it with every, power I possess, I would fight the whole of mankind, if one minute were all I could last before I were murdered, I would fight in the full confidence of the justice of my battle and of a living being's right to exist. If it is now the belief of my fellow men, who call themselves the public, that their good requires victims, then I say: The public good be damned, I will have no part of it!" (Ayn Rand, Atlas Shrugged)

What does the destruction of a community matter, if it lives on lies? It ought to be razed to the ground. I tell you-- All who live by lies ought to be exterminated like vermin! You will end by infecting the whole country; you will bring about such a state of things that the whole country will deserve to be ruined. And if things come to that pass, I shall say from the bottom of my heart: Let the whole country perish, let all these people be exterminated! (H. Ibsen, Enemy of the people)

Special note for the English edition of this text: Due to some words usage peculiarities I will use terms "society" and "community" interchangeably. "Society" is basically gonna mean a "large community". I explore this in more detail at the end of the chapter.

Having dealt with nature, let's switch to the last pillar upon which collective morality is built. Herd mentality and herd life style are being the most ancient form of the organization of people as descendants of primates. This form used to contribute to the survival of relatively small animals lacking significant strength in the aggressive environment, thus it has predominated in evolution. Hereof originates altruism – that is just obscured egoism, and it is mostly promoted by the weak and dependent. Meaning sincerely promoted. It's always based on the vested interest. Both one who donates and one who accepts are getting some sort of profit. As someone of Rockefellers (it seems) said: «Of each dollar I spend on charity I make ten dollars off» (I may be wrong about exact

numbers or words of the phrase but that's not a big deal). Even though this profit isn't material, there's still some form of pleasure or interest. Also, altruism may be a way of getting rid of discomfort that comes from moral prejudices instilled in childhood. The latter is the very dogmatic form of altruism placed above an individual which should go away.

Mob mentality has been actively exploited by religions and state. During the Reformation period, on the wave of development of humanism, this gave rise of such forms of collective identity as nationalism, “national consciousness” and then “class consciousness”. Although the idea itself that 'the voice of the people is the voice of god' had existed since Middle Ages, that is by the modern period it has become predominant. Around the same time the new ghost – abstract “society” becomes a new source of any legitimacy. Phenomena are considered right or wrong, opinions true or false on the basis of the majority, “community”, “all normal people” thinking so. What are these “normal people”? These are “normal people” about whom Culieres said that at the day when there were no longer be half-normal people the civilized world would die, not due to excess of wisdom but excess of mediocrity. One of distinctive features of normies is being their suggestibility, the constant readiness to follow the voice of the majority, “public opinion”. These are cookie-cutter people, the people of pattern, banality, fashion. They are always for virtue. They are always conservative; out of a sense of self-defense they stick to the old which they are used to, accommodated, and afraid of anything new. Their IQ is usually around 100, lacking of more sophisticated needs these are simple, primitive people that good at some unsophisticated crafts. In other words, these are commoners with philistine thinking. That is, this philistine rabble is implicitly implied by “society”. Society is an abstraction, it doesn't exist, there are just individuals, many of who are small-minded and suggestible. And this rabble is supposed to be a source of truth and normativity. Obviously this is absurd, and such a “truth” is not close to objectivity. This is just another god. And, like any god, it feeds on emptiness, the absence of information. In the case of community it's known as “the spiral of silence” – a situation when a commoner thinks that the majority wouldn't agree with them and, being afraid of ostracism and isolation, follows what is “generally accepted”, other commoners do the same, thus, as a result, “public opinion” (at the beginning of its formation) is made by those a few who spoke out actively against the “holy”. Just like an early christian saint who went and chopped off the pagan oak (a holy site at that moment) while others hesitated, and those got over it. All in all, **the general public opinion is an opinion of those who have no opinion.** It doesn't matter whether there is a real risk of isolation, these are still prim**a**tive ape atavisms – mob mentality. There were experiments wherein the majority intentionally expressed wrong opinion and a test subject changed their point to that of majority. Societal attitudes and norms a lot resemble the situation in the experiment with monkeys in the cage that were poured with cold water each time they tried to take banana. Then they stopped being poured, one of monkeys was replaced with a new one that's never been poured, and others didn't let it take banana. Then one more monkey were replaced, and as it tries to take banana others attacked it, including the one that's never been poured with cold water. Thus, there gradually was the situation established where no monkey was poured with water but they didn't let each other take banana. Why? Because that's the way it is. Similar techniques of collective responsibility are widely in use in army, jail and other similar institutions for maintaining herd mentality and controllability. So, when another chav says something like “army/jail gives you life lessons!”, “makes you a real man!” etc, he, perhaps unconsciously, means this very training and conformism, dissolution in this primitive-bestial, “collective unconscious” that was also, by the way, invented on the wave of popularity of left ideas and overall passion to the collective. They say like “humans are social beings”. High-prim**a**tive ones (with pronounced features of primates) – yes, indeed. However, as Schopenhauer said: «A high degree of intellect tends to make a man unsocial.»
Society is a one more idea, a try to place a supreme being, an absolute over me and equip it with the independent will.

By society I understand, in essence, an “extended community”. Often by it a set of interactions

between individuals is understood. But on having what volume of interactions are we entitled to say that we deal with society and not individuals? In essence, an interaction of two persons is already “society”, and as soon as these two persons cease their interaction, a “society” disappears. On this regard, society is a completely virtual thing that exists only for the one who is involved in a social interaction, and just as long as this interaction lasts. Additionally, if we understand society as an interaction between individuals, this deprives such formulations as “public opinion” (=”social opinion”, in English the idiomatic phrase is a little less explicit), “society wants this and that”, “public property” of any sense, making them as absurd as “interactions opinion”, “interactions want this and that”, “interactions property” and so on.
Society is an enemy of freedom, and in order to make an individual free it should be destroyed. Solely the herd collective thinking fills up an abstract concept of “society” with the particular content, so when I say that society should be destroyed, I don't mean elimination of any interpersonal interactions but liquidation of the herd consciousness.
With the growth of civilization and globalization, one the one hand, the area of social interactions is expanding but, on the other hand, its “density” is decreasing, the force of social interactions is weakening, so called “society” becomes more and more dilute and atomized and eventually this abstraction will completely go extinct. In a sense, society at certain point becomes to conflict with community, and with the atomization of Gesellschaft it will contain less and less Gemeinschaft.

In conclusion, a couple of words about objectivity. The reasoning is often heard where radicalism is opposed to objectivity, some people even argued me seriously that ancient perception of the world was objective on the argument that majority shared it... This is also influence of the god society. On the contrary to widespread misconception, **objectivity is not being an arithmetic mean of subjective opinions**. What an egalitarian sophism! Objectivity is the way how the material world is, and fundamentally it is dialectically consistent. A is A.
Amid the popularization of science some low-minded interpretations of quantum effects have become common. Schrodinger's cat and Wigner's friend paradox are the most often referred. Sometimes even news crop up with tittle like “Scientists proved that objective reality doesn't exist” with reference to this paradox. But such an idea is rather in line with the concept of objective reality being a product of our senses which is nonsense because these senses would be a product of themselves, then. It's said that “cat can be recognized completely alive or completely dead only when all people know the result of the experiment”. But some people's or even one person's knowledge doesn't effect the objective truth of the material world in the slightest. After all, if majority thought in ancient times Earth to be flat and sun revolving around it this doesn't mean that opinion was objective or truth. But those thought experiments of extrapolating quantum effect on macro-objects were rather critic of superposition uncertainty principle and pointed out inadequacy of the methods used, and didn't claim an object to simultaneously exist in two states in reality. If a measure itself affects the final result in a random way it doesn't absolutely mean that objective reality doesn't exist, a fundamentally different measuring method just needs to be found.
Nonetheless, some commoners persistently try to weave quantum effects into everything, even human mind. The old religious ideas of mind not being material took new form with the involvement of concepts of inlocality and quantum entanglement, so some started to claim brain being just a receiver of some not clearly defined “wave of conscious”. A theoretical physicist Robert Deikgraaf commented this as following: *“Some people have irresistible desire to necessarily look for the key to unclear phenomena in theoretical physics. But, unfortunately, all features of quantum particles disappear too quickly as more than a couple of those collide. Quantum entanglement and inlocality – the phenomena whereby particles are bound at a distance and can mutually influence one another – crop up merely in special conditions: at the temperature of one billionth above the absolute zero and extremely high isolation from external environment. In the warm complex system like human brain or environment around it existence of anything from quantum world is impossible. It's easy to calculate on the flip side of an envelop that this is mathematically impossible.”*

At this point I think I can finish with debunking of the three primary spooks that have been ruling so far.

Thus, an appeal to “public/social order”, “natural order” are not different from an appeal to “divine order”. “God. Nature. Community” – that's the holy trinity of mankind. God which is Logos i.e. “word” – idea, god which is a dirty hippie Jesus, the proponent of equality and brotherhood, and executed as a slave – an idol of the plebeian rabble who impersonates “community”, and “the holy spirit” which is wind – a force of nature. Here's symbolism! And, having all sorts of supreme beings, any absolute put over me toppled, I proclaim the primary principle of dialectical immoralism, the nihilistic triad: **Fuck god! Fuck nature! Fuck society!**

Nationalism and patriotism.

“The cheapest sort of pride is national pride; for if a man is proud of his own nation, it argues that he has no qualities of his own of which he can be proud; otherwise he would not have recourse to those which he shares with so many millions of his fellowmen. The man who is endowed with important personal qualities will be only too ready to see clearly in what respects his own nation falls short, since their failings will be constantly before his eyes. But every miserable fool who has nothing at all of which he can be proud adopts, as a last resource, pride in the nation to which he belongs; he is ready and glad to defend all its faults and follies tooth and nail, thus reimbursing himself for his own inferiority.” (A. Schopenhauer)

As have been noted, a herd is the oldest form of organization of the living, and humans in particular. In the face of the aggressive environment and competition of various herds, tribes, communes for resources the ability of thinking to discriminate “ours” from “theirs” was an important evolutionary advantage. It could take different forms but the bottom line was the same. Up till the end of Middle Ages religion was the basis of the nationhood. In fact the church taught a person to be more loyal to it than to the state because this was making an idol, national/ethnic traditions were eradicated or assimilated by religion. If a national leader went against the will of the church his country might undergone an interdict. Its influence might be very significant and can be compared to economical sanctions or cutting off SWIFT today. For example, the interdict made the emperor Henry IV to kneel in front of Pope's residence for three days – the incident known as the road to Canossa. In the modern period religion's place was taken by humanism which has given the rise to several ideologies and new forms of collective identity. All these ideologies had a quite christian basis and can be outlined as “ideologies of the common good”.
Patriotism, in particular, is the idea of serving to the state, nationalism is that of serving to the nation. These concepts are usually interchangeable and nation is deemed to be the whole state's population, as well as the national state itself. The words “nation” and “nationality” are almost identical in meaning (the latter may mean person being subject of a state or territory). Although, nationality and nation mean rather ethnicity and nation's being a vague 'narod' in post-Soviet area. (Well, this paragraph is redundant for the English text, I translated it only for sake of completeness). Anyway, even with taking this distinction, a patriot is different from a nationalist only in that of having more wide concept of “ours”.
National identity has not been solely based upon phenotypic traits, race or language, but also on religion, values, traditions, collective morality. Prior to this, the universal church began to disintegrate as the Reformation took place, and one after another the national churches under secular authorities jurisdiction have spawned from it. Over time religion and confession became a personal business but national sentiment had taken its place to that moment. Before this had many wars been religious, fight was mostly for belief, but by this time it was said to fight for fatherland and nation. Sure it might be all together (like “for belief, tsar and fatherland) but here I only talk about how the general accent has shifted, of course many of this existed and still do simultaneously, not alternating one another in strict sequence.

In fact, **national identity is just a social construct and not something that's really existing.** After all, the classification based on phenotypic traits, religion, language is as arbitrary as that based upon acquired traits, sense of self or something else, and isn't objectively anyhow better. Many nationalism proponents do even admit that it's enough for person to consider themselves having certain nationality to be part of it. During population census, as far I remember, persons can count themselves among any nationality/ethnicity, some even identify themselves as fictional ones like elves and hobbits. Anyway, nation, as well as patriotism, is a collectivist construct, another supreme being put above person which the state has been based upon and played on most primitive feelings. The narratives in line with "they rob us", "they rape our women" can be heard in the nationalistic rhetoric until now.

Thus, serving to god and the church has been replaced with serving to motherland and the state – a special case of the god "society". This was amply expressed in Hegel's formulation of the concept of "world soul" who also explicitly compared the state to god.

In ancient time nationalism and patriotism had rational basis yet. Enemy's attack had that time a real prospect of losing territory and property. Men usually were killed or taken into slavery, women were raped and also enslaved. But what's now? Foreign territory isn't usually needed to be explicitly taken (even when it's taken this is done under cover of "people's will"), slavery is not profitable, nobody needs a commoner's couch that three generations farted in, an apartment in Saratov isn't also needed by a potential invader. As V. Novodvorskaya said *"If the US attack Russia it would be good for us. It's better for Russia to be a state of the USA. But I think Americans don't need us. Therefore we should prepare to war with stupidity, degradation and restoration of soviet practices*".* After all, what are the objective reasons to be a patriot and defend the country? Invader will take natural resources? Those don't belong to a patriot anyway, in fact. Standard of living will worsen? More taxes will be taken? Fat chance. It's more profitable today to make standards of living on geopolitically advantageous territories better as it was done in defeated Germany and Japan. Also, professional contract army would deal with military tasks way better than civilians. In the past men were prepared for warfare since childhood, today this makes no sense. Patriotism implies motherland to be the supreme value but, in fact, it was this way as long as it was interconnected with the personal good. For the majority the good is material wealth, and the West is better at providing it than Russia, for example, so why not selling motherland if the price is good? What's so bad if it is disintegrated and, say, Moscovia and Ingria will appear in place of it? Deprived of nuclear weapon and integrated into the EU. There will be the same birches in Moscovia as now in Russia. Likewise, emotional patriots will be *«…утратив скромность, одуревши в доску/ Как жену чужую, обнимать березку»*(*'hugging the birch' – too much fuss to make Esenin's lyrics adaptation).

The only ones who really have reason to be patriots are those in power, the rulers. Losing the country for them is losing a source of income, privileges and oftentimes life. Especially this is the case for authoritarian countries, where the crown usually gets off along with the head – those are the ones who most actively cultivate patriotism. As Trotsky said: *"Patriotism was inextricably linked the power and property throughout the history".*

In th modern period territories was yet actively conquered and there was certain profit from patriotism, nonetheless it was already far-fetched and quantity of ones willing to die for motherland was decreasing. As soon as by WW1 it had showed itself in mass desertion and refusal to fight. State and public ideology start getting transformed, it is proposed now to sacrifice the personal egoistic interests for sake of not the country or its leader but its nation, population which is now meant by motherland. Here had been the next transformation of public spirit, that "collective god". Thus we reach socialism in particular and the left idea in general.

Fascism. Nazism. Naturalness.

Without a shadow of a doubt the Germans are idealists. On two occasions when, at the cost of enormous courage and self-control, an upright, unequivocal, and perfectly scientific attitude of

mind had been attained, the Germans were able to discover back stairs leading down to the old "ideal" again, compromises between truth and the "ideal," and, in short, formulæ for the right to reject science and to perpetrate falsehoods. Leibniz and Kant—these two great breaks upon the intellectual honesty of Europe! Finally, at a moment when there appeared on the bridge that spanned two centuries of decadence, a superior force of genius and will which was strong enough to consolidate Europe and to convert it into a political and economic unit, with the object of ruling the world, the Germans, with their Wars of Independence, robbed Europe of the significance (F. Nietzsche, Ecce Homo)

For starters, I'll write briefly on fascism and nazism. These were essentially based upon two pillars of the traditional morality at once – nature and society. The first one was expressed in biologization, appeal to “naturalness”, the second was in nationalism and the “common good”, good of nation rhetoric. In essence these are quite humanist ideologies – they also have human being as a supreme value, not each individual but human being as a collectivity, the one fitting the idea of “human”. For fascists and nazis human being is of value as a part of nation, ein Volk. Same as for communists that is valuable as a part of society, community, a collective. Communists had proletariat, nazis had German worker. In essence these the left ideas, too.
These ideologies were the natural outcome of the general discourse of thinking of that time. When religion and church had lost their former authority people, alas, didn't refuse all those foundations and prejudices originated by religion and church, instead they began to seek the confirmation of those in the new authorities, for example in nature. Thus, Kant refusing god yet justifies the religious morality and, as a result, ends up with categorical imperative and “moral law inside us”. Later, Freud being in the same paradigm made up “superego” as a component of “psychic” (that is, in fact, just a re-branding of soul) responsible for morality. Also, Darwin's discoveries played a large part in this, the natural selection theory became quite popular and was actively exploited. The influence of social-darwinism is seen in the texts of Stirner, Nietzsche, Redbeard and others. The idea was actively used by ideological opponents of the left egalitarianists gaining popularity on the wave of social and technical transformation. What fascists, and especially nazies, did is they put the two major trends of their time together – the ideas of common good and social-darwinism. Jews and other nation were assigned as a scapegoat. Thus, both the old aristocracy and the rabble were contented, as nobody claimed to the property and status of the former and some social benefits were given to the latter, as well as improving of the standard of living was promised by means of “living space extension”. Therefore usefulness for nation and naturalness became the measure of normativity and humanity with the rest being deviation from the norm, anyone who doesn't fit these criteria is not human enough, “subhuman”, or at least “sick” (the option preferred by communists).
Although nazis apparently used the term Untermensch as antonym to nietzschean Ubermensch, it had a little to do with Nietzsche's idea. Even though he was anti-egalirarian he didn't worship to naturalness (yet didn't seek getting rid of any instincts like christians did), wasn't a collectivist and wrote that «man is something that is to be surpassed», criticized anti-semites and his “overman*” is a destroyer of the old moral values. *“Behold the good and just! Whom do they hate most? Him who breaketh up their tables of values, the breaker, the lawbreaker:—he, however, is the creator.” “BESIDE the bad conscience hath hitherto grown all KNOWLEDGE! Break up, break up, ye discerning ones, the old tables!” “And also this parable give I unto you: Not a few who meant to cast out their devil, went thereby into the swine themselves. To whom chastity is difficult, it is to be dissuaded: lest it become the road to hell—to filth and lust of soul.” (Thus spoke Zarathustra)*
So, if Nietzsche had wanted to introduce the antonym to superhuman* the thing just the opposite to that of Nazis, who fetched religious idealism to the materialist, quite correct ideas of darwinism, would have understood by it. By the way, Hitler was the first leader who introduced the concept of “animals rights” but I'll get back to this later.
(*Special note for English edition of this text: Even though the common translation of nietzschean Ubermensch is superman, since my childhood I strictly associate superman with that comic strip guy in the leotard, so I'm not gonna use this words with exception of quotes. I don't also want to

assume gender, so I will use either the original German word or the term superhuman from now on. By the way I quite sure that flying humanistic beefcake was inspired by Nazism, perhaps by Lothrop Stoddard's ideas who first introduced the term “under-man”.)

Communism and socialism.

Ye preachers of equality, the tyrant-frenzy of impotence crieth thus in you for "equality": your most secret tyrant-longings disguise themselves thus in virtue-words! (F. Nietzsche, Thus spoke Zarathustra)

Communism, by the abolition of all personal property, only presses me back still more into dependence on another, viz., on the generality or collectivity; and, loudly as it always attacks the “State,” what it intends is itself again a State, a status, a condition hindering my free movement, a sovereign power over me. Communism rightly revolts against the pressure that I experience from individual proprietors; but still more horrible is the might that it puts in the hands of the collectivity. (M. Stirner, Ego and its own)

It is by the loftiest and strongest instincts, when they break out passionately and carry the individual far above and beyond the average, and the low level of the gregarious conscience, that the self-reliance of the community is destroyed, its belief in itself, its backbone, as it were, breaks, consequently these very instincts will be most branded and defamed. The lofty independent spirituality, the will to stand alone, and even the cogent reason, are felt to be dangers, everything that elevates the individual above the herd, and is a source of fear to the neighbour, is henceforth called evil, the tolerant, unassuming, self-adapting, self-equalizing disposition, the mediocrity of desires, attains to moral distinction and honour. (F.Nietzsche, Beyond good and evil)

Communism goes side by side with fascism. Despite of the latter having been positioned itself as a defender of traditional values, often religion, and being reactionary in general, precisely the former turns to be more christian. Eric Hoffer writes: *“Hitler looked on the German communists as potential national socialists: "The petit bourgeois social-democrat and trade-union boss will never make a national socialist, but the communist always will." Captain Rohm boasted that he could turn the reddest communist into a glowing nationalist in four weeks. On the other hand, Karl Radek look on the Nazi Brown Shirts (S.A.) as a reserve for future communist recruits.”* Fascism is a bit in line with old testament christianity while communism is rather in line with new testament one. This is also humanist concept – a human being is supreme value therein but, again, not as an individual but as a “social being”, human being as a member of society, community. While Nazis wanted to bring human beings to christian ideal by means of eugenics, communists want to do this by means of training, nurture. Both are anti-individualist and anti-liberal, and as lambs got used to enter red gates it's enough to paint any gates red and it doesn't matter whether swastika or hammer and sickle on it.

There is now a trend, primarily among “new left”, of distinguishing or even contrasting consents of communism and socialism – like “there was communism in USSR but we're for socialism” or that USSR had state capitalism. Actually Hitler spoke about it, too: *“Socialism is a doctrine about how common good should be cared of. Communism is not socialism. Marxism is not socialism. Marxists stole this idea and distorted its meaning. I'll wrench socialism out of arms of socialists. Socialism is an ancient Aryan German tradition. Our ancestors used some lands collectively. They developed the idea of common good. Marxism has no right masquerading as socialism. Unlike Marxism, socialism doesn't deny private property and person's individuality. Unlike Marxism, socialism is patriotic.*”* Well, as for “doesn't deny individuality” he was clearly wrong, any collectivist idea denies individuality in a degree, also Nazis in fact put private property under state control. It's like it is now in Russia: it's technically private but if there is a need a reason to take it away will be found, and government can regulate any aspects of entrepreneur's business. Here should be noted that “socialism” mean “social” and originally was opposed to individualism, in such a form the

idea of socialism existed in Middle Ages, Marx just took this popular idea and really distorted it in part (although the broad masses yet understand it generally as before). “Communism” originates of the word “commune” i.e. “community”. Both are inherently anti-individualist and collectivist, and suggest in sacrifice personal good for sake of common one. Socialism is usually in a bit less degree than communism. However, Marx and Engels remove any difference declaring socialism a stage on the way to communism. Anyway, in the context of this analysis of the basic idea these difference isn't significant therefore I will use these terms interchangeably.

Christianity, as well as other religions, actively exploited these ape herd ideas. Precisely the dirty communistic hippie Jesus was the first who condemned the “consumer society”, spread miasma of “social justice” and practiced victim behavior. Most vividly it was expressed in the sermon on the mount: *“Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moths and vermin destroy, and where thieves break in and steal.”(Mat. 6:19) “Therefore I tell you, do not worry about your life, what you will eat or drink; or about your body, what you will wear. Is not life more than food, and the body more than clothes?”(Mat. 6:25) “And why do you worry about clothes? See how the flowers of the field grow. They do not labor or spin.”(Mat. 6:28) “So do not worry, saying, ‘What shall we eat?’ or ‘What shall we drink?’ or ‘What shall we wear?’ For the pagans run after all these things”(Mat. 6:31)* Koran also condemns accumulation of wealth and case of only personal well-being, and calls for donation of alms to the poor (zakat). It is one of five pillars of islam. Additionally, Shia's analogue of the second coming of Christ is anticipation of twelfth hidden imam (Mahdi), a descendant of Muhammad the prophet, which is supposed to come at the end of time to rule muslims and re-establish justice on the Earth.

Since its very emergence christianity gained popularity among plebeians and slaves. Precisely christianity first gave rise to the ideas of equality and brotherhood for all, love for one's neighbor, precisely christianity was marked with propaganda of asceticism, cult of self-humiliation and misery, hatred to wealth and aspiration to deprive and divide (*“Jesus answered, “If you want to be perfect, go, sell your possessions and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come, follow me.”(Mat. 19:21) “But many who are first will be last, and many who are last will be first.”(Mat. 19:30) “For those who exalt themselves will be humbled, and those who humble themselves will be exalted.”(Mat. 23:12)*).
By the way, “kingdom of heaven” is explicitly compared in the bible to a house owner that hired employees for his vineyard, some of those came “about nine in the morning” while others later, “about five in the afternoon ” but “each received a denarius”(Mat. 20:1-20)

However Jesus was also quite nationalistic and always spoke (at least till “resurrection”) merely about Hebrew nation. *“A Canaanite woman from that vicinity came to him, crying out, “Lord, Son of David, have mercy on me! My daughter is demon-possessed and suffering terribly.” Jesus did not answer a word. So his disciples came to him and urged him, “Send her away, for she keeps crying out after us.” He answered, “I was sent only to the lost sheep of Israel.” The woman came and knelt before him. “Lord, help me!” she said. He replied, “It is not right to take the children’s bread and toss it to the dogs.” (Mat. 15:22-28) “Do not go among the Gentiles or enter any town of the Samaritans. Go rather to the lost sheep of Israel.” (Mat. 10:5-6).* His doctrine was spread on all mankind way later, at least several centuries past his alleged death (actually such a person barely existed in reality, this is rather an amalgam of many Jewish “prophets” of that time). So, all the ranting about justice, equality, as well as all the commandments ought to be understood with the annotation “members only”. And since this unlucky Jewish demagogue was on the one hand a lot socialist, and on the other hand a nationalist, I'd say it wouldn't be too wrong to consider him as the first national-socialist. Really, as it comes to populism he was a match for the Austrian artist...Add to this the fact that according to the bible Moses earlier wiped out heretics of the living space for “divinely appointed people” complying with god's commandment. *“However, in the cities of the nations the LORD your God is giving you as an inheritance, do not leave alive anything that*

breathes. Completely destroy them—the Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites and Jebusites—as the LORD your God has commanded you."(Deut. 20:16-17). "So the LORD our God also gave into our hands Og king of Bashan and all his army. We struck them down, leaving no survivors." *(Deut. 3:3); "destroying every city—men, women and children. But all the livestock and the plunder from their cities we carried off for ourselves."(Deut. 3:6-7). "and brought out the people who were there, consigning them to labor with saws and with iron picks and axes, and he made them work at brickmaking."(2 Sam, 12:31), also 1 Chronicles 20:3.**(the translation is uncertain, another version is that they were killed with saws and iron picks and axes, and put in brickmaking ovens.) *"Slaughter the old men, the young men and women, the mothers and children" (Ezekiel 9:6).*
Precisely in christianity (as well as in islam based on it) usury was banned, whereof roots of antisemitism originate. *"Do not charge a fellow Israelite interest, whether on money or food or anything else that may earn interest."(Deut. 23:19), "Allah has permitted trading and forbidden interest"(surah Al-Baqarah, ayat 275).* Many today like to present protestantism as a proof of "christianity supporting capitalism and driving European civilization forward". But, ultimately, this is schism, it appeared way later, in the Reformation when church authority has weakened. In fact, the time of uprise and power of christianity was accompanied by a thousand year stagnation. Though, explicitly communistic regimes also usually resort to some nationalism in practice, and always become almost fascist or national-socialist.

The most widespread objection to the christian nature of communism is the indication that communists blew up churches and religion was banned in USSR. Well, yes, they did, but rather as competitors. If Muslims blow up a church they won't become less god believers. Despite religion per se being somewhat banned (not very harshly though) the religious thinking was thriving: state instead of god, red leaders instead of prophets and kings, tombs in the style of Egyptian pharaohs (not just in USSR but also in China, North Korea, Venezuela...), pilgrimage to Lenin's relics instead of that of the saints, the leaders' speeches on the top of his tomb like Indian priests did in South America. Marx and Engels works instead of the bible, "Lenin forever alive" almost like resurrected Jesus, May 1st processions instead of sacred processions. With building communism instead of "entering the kingdom of heaven". "Peace. Labor. May". Arbeit macht frei. Hooray, brig fellas! And let's take, for example, all that leftist pseudo-"objectification" and "rape by a glance" among sjw and radical "feminists". *"But I tell you that anyone who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart.»(Mat. 5:28).*
No wonder that precisely the countries of the communistic, left block turned ultimately to be the most social conservative ones – it's enough to compare the level of homophobia, conservatism, nationalism in the East and West Europe. While the "sexual revolution" actively went on in the capitalist West, LGBT received the more rights, women shook off the burden of patriarchy, the communistic countries languished in the reactionary society of total Puritanism and pervasive censorship in art and movies and everything, with firing for adultery. Restrictions on abortions still have place in Poland (updated: now another try to virtually ban them undertaken), transphobic laws adopted in Hungary, Soros' foundation was banned... USSR had penal provisions on sodomy for its very end. In Romania of Ceausescu, abortions as well as contraception were prohibited, women were visited by "menstrual police" and forced to have pregnancy test, the non-pregnant paid a higher fine. Antisemitism also had place in USSR, albeit in a more soft, obscured way than in Third Reich. There are segregation of sorts, and person with Jewish roots might be denied in employment or enrollment in university, for example. So, people usually hid such things. I think if it were as hard for Jews to hide their origin as it is for the black, Jews would sit in the back of the bus and had special seats in the cinema and other things in USSR.

I write "communism" but it virtually was socialism. Building communism was a goal. Yeah, the left would tell me that it "wasn't real socialism" but ordinary fascism or "state capitalism". Well, yes, it was. But where's real one? It doesn't exist in reality, only in mind. It's idealistic concept. As have

been said before, inequality is the basis of any sort of movement, the basis of evolution and life accordingly. People aren't equal whilst implementation of equality puts them on Procrustean bed of the egalitarian ideal. Any try of the practical implementation of equality therefore deemed to be forcible, authoritarian. Just as the case of nationalism, interests of an individual are sacrificed for sake of "common good". Both nationalism and communism are the collectivist, plebeian ideas that put some sort of community, rabble – in one case it is nation, in another it's society – over an individual vested interest. This is vividly seen, for instance, in speeches of aforementioned Ceausescu: *"Human fetus is the property of whole <u>society</u>. Everyone who doesn't want to have children are deserters which break the laws of succession of generations and maintenance of <u>nation</u>.*"* As W. Reich writes: *"The primary element of sexual morality is the idea of sexual act can't be an action independent from reproduction and aimed to fulfill a certain need and reach pleasure*"* Given this, some progressive initiatives of communists like legalization of abortions, decriminalization of same sex relationships had existed in practice as long as the state was weak – during the civil war. However, since they fought for the collectivity they ended up having the same collective morality and prohibitions. Here's what Lenin wrote on this: *«Changed young-lings attitude to the issues of sex life is surely "principled" and allegedly based on the theory. Many call their position "revolutionary" and "communistic". They sincerely think this is so. I, an old man, am not agreeable to this. Though I'm not a sulky ascetic in the slightest, but so called "new sex life" of young people – oftentimes the adult too – often seems to me being purely bourgeois, a kind of good bourgeois brothel. All this have nothing to do with the free love as we, communists, understand it. You sure know the famous theory that satisfaction of sex desire and love needs in communist society is as simple and insignificant thing as to drink a glass of water. Our youngsters literally went wild of this "glass of water theory". This theory became the ill-fate of many young men and women. Its proponents claim this theory to be Marxist. Thank you for such a "Marxism" that derives all phenomena and changes directly and straightforwardly, solely from economical basis. It's not that simple.[...] Drinking water is really personal business. However, it takes two to love, and the new third life appears. Here lies the public interest and duty to the collective takes place.» (C. Zetkin, Reminiscences of Lenin, M. 1955, p.48-49)* Famous communist Smidovitch wrote in "Pravda" bulletin: *"Youngsters seem to think that the most primitive outlook on sexual issues is being communistic. And everything beyond the primitive outlook, which may fit a Hottentot or even more primitive representatives of primal nations, means in practice signs of philistinism and bourgeois attitude to the sex issue."* The more quotes might be added but I think it's enough. So, what did communists mean by free love? Sure it was christian love for one's neighbor.

The idea of equality, as well as patriotism/nationalism, initially originates from the instinct for self-preservation. In the time of tribal relations survival primary depended on the survival of the group, personal interests therefore matched tribal interests. To be exact there was even no concept of personality. In some preserved primitive tribes there are even no word "I", only "we". It used to work for small groups isolated one from another, additionally in aggressive environment. However, with growing human communities equality got "shallow" turning into rather restrictive than beneficial factor for an individual. The more the individual surpassed others at something the more restrictive for him or her it got. The most profitable equality was for the most miserable and mediocre. Therefore, quite soon (by historical standards at least), as mankind had moved from tribal relation to states, this idea started to fester foremost among slaves. The idea is also actively used by religions. It wasn't yet an idea in the tribes, though, rather just natural organization due to current circumstances. It was equality for the inner circle where everyone was often connected to others with family ties. But, as a French politician later said: "son is closer than nephew; nephew closer than friend; friend is closer than stranger; French stranger is closer than that of foreign culture." Equality became inapplicable in the growing human communities. As long as there were various city-states, like Greek poleis, democracy had place and it was extended primary to nobility which was considered citizens. With the states growing the category of citizens expanded, too, and their influence decreased. In the late Rome everyone except slaves were citizens. That was foremost done

to collect more taxes. In fact those were subjects – subjects of taxation ("подданные" i.e "те кто под данью"). With slavery and feudalism dieing off and on the wave of interest to antiquity, all inhabitants of the state became citizens. But in fact those were the same subjects of taxation, just the category of slave had petered out. And christianity, the religion originally spread among slaves, had already been common and called the shots of virtually whole "classical" philosophical thought. "Classical" means "something that fits the pattern" – including state's one, social canons as it comes to an idea... "Classical literature" is the censor-approved literature, and so on.
The development from christianity to humanism has been earlier described, so I switch back to socialism per se without repeating myself. "Man is god to man" Feuerbach said. He also writes that there's sure not anything beyond, things we ascribed to god and religious testaments are purely human features, and that church, state and capitalism distorted the doctrine of Jesus who were for justice (and actually the first communist, as later Zyuganov said). In response to Stirner's criticism that "he destroys merely God, the subject, but leaves intact the divine, the predicates of God" Feuerbach replies: *"Of course he leaves them, but he has to do so, otherwise he couldn't have left intact neither nature nor god: for God is a creature compounded of all forms of reality, i.e. features (predicates) of nature and humanity; God is light, life, power, beauty, substance, intelligence, mind, love. So, what would be left if even predicates of God cease to exist?"* Thus, he rejects just one complement of god – the notional old man on the cloud, a beyond world being, but doesn't dare to go all the way and subvert the authority of other two gods or hypostases – nature and society. The divine becomes moral, religious values turn into "universal human values". As Stirner said: " Feuerbach's provision: theology is anthropology". God created by man finally returns into man – *"for dust you are and to dust you will return."(Gen.3:19)* Not meaning that person was acknowledged to be god, human being stayed supreme being put above the person in the form of "moral law", "superego", "humanity" and so on. While there was equality before god in christianity, it first became equality before the state (state is god according to Hegel), law in humanism, and then equality and brotherhood before each another, society, since "man is god to man". This brings us to the next stage of development of christianity – tolerance. But I'll write on this a bit later. At the dawn of socialism, however, the concept of a "collective wisdom", romanticizing of image of "honorable savage" and longing for "good old times" of primitive communism were popular.

In essence "equality" is purely literary concept. Equality and brotherhood is only at the cemetery. Absolute equality is absence of any movement, state of complete rest, this is death. Some sort of transcendent state. Eastern religions have had a quite popular technique of denying oneself move – meditation, as a way to merge with the transcendental. Nobody sure needed equality per se, it was foremost a tool to fulfill their own needs, their egoistic aspiration which is of character for everything living. But, at the same time, if taken in a larger scale, it is also aspiration for death of sorts. Freud even had such a theory – the death drive – that of everything living is driven to return to the original (non-living, non-organic) state. This is sure a little far fetched but at least symbolically this is consistent with christianity and its successor – socialism. As well as christianity socialism dreams about "kingdom of god" – communism, but on the earth instead of heaven, looks for eternal bliss. Actually, the crucial point of the most of religions is the disposal of suffering. In christianity and islam, this is implemented by entering heaven. Buddhism, wondering about the reason of suffering, ends up with conclusion that the reason of suffering is desire, and, therefore, one has to get rid of desires to eliminate suffering by going through the eightfold path (this path is understood as the spiral movement, by the way) which leads to liberation (in fact, like in christianity, "of this world", "of this mortal coil, body", of the cycle of rebirth to be exact, the samsara) – towards nirvana. The word itself means "blown out", "release", "cease of worries". That is, in fact buddhism suggests the same asceticism and struggle against "consumer society" as it's called now. In essence, desire is basis of egoism and any sort of life. Disproportion between desire and things how they are gives raise to suffering which raises movement, development, evolution, progress... In essence, **suffering is a good thing**! Socialists had motto "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs". Actually, the needs meant 100 years ago have already

reached, however, as the saying goes, life always finds a way, and needs grow in accordance with abilities. With having this realized socialists ended up with purely buddhist conclusion (many of them were really interested in buddhism and hinduism) that they have to fight consumer society to reach “eternal bliss”.

Nirvana, kingdom of heaven with eternal bliss, equality etc. are essentially being a synonym of non-existence. Christians, buddhists, communists and others strive to achieve this state... the whole discourse of historic development is directed to achievement of the complete disposal of suffering. Any system seeks to thermodynamic equilibrium. *"Why did I not perish at birth, and die as I came from the womb? Why were there knees to receive me and breasts that I might be nursed? For now I would be lying down in peace; I would be asleep and at rest with kings and counselors of the earth, who built for themselves places now lying in ruins, with rulers who had gold, who filled their houses with silver. Or why was I not hidden in the ground like a stillborn child, like an infant who never saw the light of day? There the wicked cease from turmoil, and there the weary are at rest. Captives also enjoy their ease; they no longer hear the slave driver's shout. The small and the great are there, and the slave is freed from his master.”(Job. 3:11-19)* In essence, a grave is implied here. Actually, the word “hell”, when mentioned in the bible, also means grave, perhaps specifically grave in the soil (in contrast to a tomb where body might be embalmed, for example) for Jews in Old Testament at least , “ад (hell)” comes from Greek “hades”, “grave”. The word “hell” itself is originally more of a pagan concept adopted for that of christianity but still it apparently comes from the Old Norse hellir – “cave”, the caves were frequently used as graves or tombs. Let's take a look at the book of Isaiah, chapter 14 where Nebuchadnezzar is mentioned (based on it, the story about Lucifer toppled down into hell was later made up): “*The grave* (Hebrew “sheol” i.e. “hell”) *below is all astir to meet you at your coming; it rouses the spirits of the departed to greet you-- all those who were leaders in the world; it makes them rise from their thrones-- all those who were kings over the nations. They will all respond, they will say to you, "You also have become weak, as we are; you have become like us." All your pomp has been brought down to the grave, along with the noise of your harps; maggots are spread out beneath you and worms cover you. How you have fallen from heaven, O morning star, son of the dawn! You have been cast down to the earth, you who once laid low the nations! You said in your heart, "I will ascend to heaven; I will raise my throne above the stars of God; I will sit enthroned on the mount of assembly, on the utmost heights of the sacred mountain. I will ascend above the tops of the clouds; I will make myself like the Most High." But you are brought down to the grave, to the depths of the pit. Those who see you stare at you, they ponder your fate: "Is this the man who shook the earth and made kingdoms tremble, the man who made the world a desert, who overthrew its cities and would not let his captives go home?" All the kings of the nations lie in state, each in his own tomb. But you are cast out of your tomb like a rejected branch; you are covered with the slain, with those pierced by the sword, those who descend to the stones of the pit. Like a corpse trampled underfoot, you will not join them in burial, for you have destroyed your land and killed your people. The offspring of the wicked will never be mentioned again.”(verses 9-20).* The author aspires to the ultimate equality in the grave. In order to dispel the last doubts I'll add that Jesus was in hell, too: *“Seeing what was ahead, he spoke of the resurrection of the Christ, that he was not abandoned to the grave, nor did his body see decay. God has raised this Jesus to life, and we are all witnesses of the fact.”(Acts, 2:31-32)* Jesus, by the way, was embalmed – apparently only imperishables bodies were believed to be able to resurrect (there are discrepancies, though), another influence of Egyptian beliefs. There, in hell, had also been all earlier saints. Later on, church has made up a trick saying that before redemption from the original sin all people with no exception had been doomed to hell, so Jesus had to pop by there to lift righteous men, however, as we remember the punishment was the exile from Eden as such (and rather to prevent people of taking fruit from the tree of immortality than due to this; also this garden was on the earth – the modern Syria, Iraq).

There is the widespread idea among christians that the soul leaves the body after death and goes to

either heaven or hell. Actually, the soul, according to the bible, remains in the grave with the body and supposed to resurrect only on the second coming, in the judgment day: *“I know that my redeemer lives, and that in the end he will stand on the earth. And after my skin has been destroyed, yet in my flesh I will see God; I myself will see him with my own eyes—I, and not another. How my heart yearns within me!”(Job, 19:25-27)* Also, here's the dialog with Jesus prior to Lazarus' resurrection: *«When Martha heard that Jesus was coming, she went out to meet him, but Mary stayed at home. “Lord,” Martha said to Jesus, “if you had been here, my brother would not have died. But I know that even now God will give you whatever you ask.” Jesus said to her, “Your brother will rise again.” Martha answered, “I know he will rise again in the resurrection at the last day.”»(John, 11:20-24)* Eternal punishment (not “eternal torture” as it's often translated) is the death itself. In the judgment day the total resurrection is promised. *“Then the end will come, when he hands over the kingdom to God the Father after he has destroyed all dominion, authority and power.” (1Cor, 15:24)* In other words, god and righteous men will cancel exploitation and establish communism. Although, here's the question arises: so, will god the king be abolished, too? Later on we see the alleged answer. Righteous men will become like god and be living forever. *“But our citizenship is in heaven. And we eagerly await a Savior from there, the Lord Jesus Christ, who, by the power that enables him to bring everything under his control, will transform our lowly bodies so that they will be like his glorious body. ”(Philip, 3:20-21) “Listen, I tell you a mystery: We will not all sleep, but we will all be changed — in a flash, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet. For the trumpet will sound, the dead will be raised imperishable, and we will be changed.”(1Cor, 15:51-52) «Where, O death, are your plagues? Where, O grave, is your destruction?»(Hosea, 13:14) “The last enemy to be destroyed is death.”(1Cor, 15:26)* While sinners will be returned to the hell, i.e. grave. The last book of the bible narrates of this as following: *“The sea gave up the dead that were in it, and death and Hades* (hell) *gave up the dead that were in them, and each person was judged according to what they had done. Then death and Hades were thrown into the lake of fire. The lake of fire is the second death.”(Rev, 20:13-14)* The lake of fire is not the place of eternal torture, it's just a way of execution whereby the second death of sinners comes and they return to hell, i.e. grave. The bible also has “Gehenna” mentioned which is allegedly believed to be the hell. That's even simpler – it's just a valley, the place where corpses and trash had been burned in the time of idolatry and where the fire had always burned. In certain cases, burning of people had been practiced, in particular children had been sacrificed to Moloch , the ritual itself was called molech (based upon this the rumor was spread by various conspiracy theorists, and by the church before them, about Jews killing children, though judaism forbade it and they used to sacrifice animals only). The Gehenna is apparently mentioned in metaphorically meaning the ultimate death and bad place in general. Taking this into account, the lake of fire from Revelation is not even a way of execution per se but the method whereby corpses are destroyed. Here's, quite dialectically, the new inequality is being established – the domination of the living over the dead: *“They are laid in hell like sheep: death shall feed upon them. And the just shall have dominion over them in the morning; and their help shall decay in hell from their glory.”(Ps, 48:15)* That is, the ultimate goal of christianity (as well as many other religions) is a sort of communistic world populated by the transformed, freed from their flesh, gotten rid of everything human equal and just individuals (as far as I understand, they get their flesh back in the moment of resurrection for the court, and then being transformed into spirits, gods). At the same time, it is also sort of equality among ruling ones with each being an omnipotent god (this is the only way to consistently reconcile “destruction of all dominion, authority and power” and “handing over the kingdom to god”). In this sense such a system is even closer to that I describe. In the aspiration itself to the divine state, not the aspiration to equality but on the contrary, aspiration to domination, will to power is seen. However, as have been written in the beginning, god is a synonym for emptiness, only non-existence is unlimited and eternal. “The kingdom of god” is the kingdom of emptiness. Hence, eventually all the same, and through this equivalence of the absolute and emptiness the last contradiction is eliminated. Aspiration to a certain goal makes movement possible but its achievement brings an end to any dialectical movement thus, the death drive is fulfilled. The biblical authors sure didn't think about

something like this and all their scribbling was about more mundane problems and historically closer future like the end of the captivity and punishment of oppressors of their beliefs, whilst all contradictions is rather unconscious. Nonetheless, the dialectical unity and conflict of opposites is expressed therein.

The next level of equality is slavery. “All are slaves and equal in slavery”(Dostoevsky, Demons). Slaves don't have property, they were not allowed to own weapon. Among themselves they are more or less equal. Nonetheless, a well-qualified slave still could be elevated in some extend. Another sphere close to conditions of equality and communism is jail. There is no money in jail, everyone is equal before a screw or prison governor, and is in equal conditions (well, in Russian realities it's not really the case and better conditions and privileges can be bought from the guard, but let's assume there are jails where everything is according to rules etc), but yet the hierarchy has place and role of money may be ensured by cigarettes or tea. Also, army and other facilities of casern-like sorts.

It's also necessary to decide what sort of “equality” to talk about. Usually it is understood as material, economic and social equality, the equality in consumption. In order to reach it the left want to redistribute income, declare war to”capitalism” (actually, the word itself invented by the left, in fact it corresponds to inequality and hierarchy intrinsic to human civilization up till now). *“What those people who ask for equality have in mind is always an increase in their own power to consume. In endorsing the principle of equality as a political postulate nobody wants to share his own income with those who have less. When the American wage earner refers to equality, he means that the dividends of the stockholders should be given to him. He does not suggest a curtailment of his own for the benefit of those 95 per cent of the earth's population whose income is lower than his.”(Ludwig von Mises, Human Action).* Equality in consumption of something is possible with having an absolute abundance. For instance, everyone equally consumes air because there's an abundance of it. Not equally, to be exact, but as much as they want, according to their need. It's impossible to establish equality for limited entities or it will just be useless. If there are 1000 patients and one has, say, 10 pills, ten have one pill each and the rest don't have any, there will be no use for anyone of dividing pills into equal parts. The leftists' motto like “eat the rich!” sound like the calling on rabbits to eat wolfs. If rabbits eat wolfs, both wold and rabbits will have a little benefit of it, as a result. If so called “proletariat” topple “capitalist oppressors” they will just lose their source of income and workplaces, as a result things will be worse for everyone, or, well, just take their places and become “capitalist oppressors” themselves (actually this is what proponents of equality usually want if they aren't completely detached from reality). It's possible to make a film about cruelty of the wolfs and how they oppress rabbits, and irrational philistines would take the side of rabbits, would fight for “justice”.It's also possible to make a film about starving wolflings and fat shyster rabbit who, with its cunning, fraudulent track obfuscation and other deceptive manipulation, left them starve to death, and philistines would take wolfs' side and say: “how can this be, this is unnatural! We should not break the natural order!” However, both cases in essence would be merely a try to establish a some sort of a divine absolute (advantageous for a certain group), before which everyone should kneel, over the real life looking for its benefit. Therefore, equality, in particular, implies dictatorship of the weak mediocre masses, “dictatorship of the proletariat”, serving to ideals of the rabble. There is no any “justice” or “fairness”. A just thing for one person is unjust for another. For a boxer, it's “just” and “fair” to sort things out with fists. From the point of view of a chess player it would probably be just to sort things out in a chess match. But the former, due to historical reasons, looks for majority as a natural thing while the latter looks like a joke. And if the chess player use a gun many would perceive it as something “unfair” or “cheating”, though, in essence, they act rationally, as by rationality we understand using the most effective means to reach the goal.

The essence of life is egoism, pursuit of personal benefit. In the organization of economic activity, this is particularly manifested in the market relations, competition. Inequality creates movement of goods and services. Communists: *“We can't imagine, express, estimate, depict movement without*

interrupting the uninterrupted, without simplifying, vulgarizing, dividing, killing the living. The depiction of movement by though is always vulgarizing, killing – not just by thought but also by sense, and not just movement but any idea. And this is the essence of dialectic. This very essence is expressed in the formula: unity, identity of opposites" (V. Lenin, Philosophical notebooks, vol.29, p.232 – 233) Also communists: introduce planned economy.

Apparently the equality in consumption, unlimited consumption to be exact, having which nobody cares anymore about the differences, will eventually be reached. But not because of some sort of overthrowing capitalism by proletariat, rather contrary, with the growing of the world's economy and the overall standard of living (though, Marx wrote essentially the same, but this isn't consistent with widespread understanding of leftists, so I'll review this separately). The other thing is that the needs also can grow, there will possibly appear the needs that barely can be imagined now. Leftists say like the level of inequality is growing. But the standard of living in the world in general is also growing, precisely because of capitalists. If we imagine the situation where people had always, from the moment of division of labor and emergence of employees, worked not for sake of profit and payed workers as much as the produced item costs, there wouldn't have been any growth, the economy, level of development of the means of production, technical progress and other would have likely stayed at the stage of feudalism. Money is an expression of energy, and surplus value is like surplus energy. Just like in order for a rocket to flow the energy surplus that pushes it forward is needed, same for the development of civilization. If everyone had have equal income there wouldn't have been any motivation to do more or better (in fact, this was exactly the case in USSR). That's even without taking into account dubious profitability of such manufacturing and inequality people themselves. *""To equals equality, to unequals inequality"—that would be the real speech of justice and that which follows from it "Never make unequal things equal.""(F. Nietzsche, The twilight of the idols).*

Liberalism and conservatism.

"In its paternalistic, nationalistic, and power-adoring tendencies conservatism is often closer to socialism than true liberalism" (F. Hayek)

Liberalism is also in large part a humanist concept, but everything depends here on the understanding of the subject being its essence – the liberty. In the corresponding section I have already mentioned that the christian understanding of liberty consisted in the realization of the "freedom from the material", from the restrictions imposed by the objective material reality. And if the idea of a liberal is based on this christian understanding of freedom, it degrades to either leftism or conservatism, which are essentially the same. Consistent development of the idea of freedom inevitably leads to overcoming all humane, collective and social. The majority is, alas, unable to go out of their depth, and their understanding of freedom doesn't go beyond the communality and collective good paradigm. If such a "liberal" suddenly realizes that with the acceptance of personal freedom principle follows the revaluation of all the values having existed up till now they'd think "that's too much, I'm for freedom but one with human face – with empathy, mutual help, two genders, nation, justice..." and the like, wouldn't dare to take this step turning to conservatism or socialism. I'm deliberately not using here the term "classical liberalism" for this very reason – there appear too many conservatives disguised as liberals and even libertarians. Conservatives are essentially the same SJW leftists. What are really homophobes, racists, muslims and other traditional values proponents driven by? That is foremost their hurt feelings and desire to get rid of the "triggers", prohibit everything that somehow offends them. In essence, conservatives are the same proponents of political correctness just having other "oppressed group". The thinking is yet plebeian and victimized. Ones got "whites heterosexual men are oppressed", others got "islamophobia", thirds got "fatphobia" but the essence is the same. With giving in to plebeians, of course one group can start to oppress another. So far, it used to be conservative plebeians but can also be some leftists (adjusted for the general level of social development). That is, conservatives of

the future will call themselves leftists. The free market proponents are also ought be distinguished from conservatives. Even though we don't take into account cultural peculiarities of conservatism in each country and taking just western conservatism, it should be understood what market means for conservatives. At least it's just an incidental element of the tradition in general, at most it's perceived as a tool to save old traditions. For example, conservatives propose "private discrimination" but only one based on traditional mindset, when it comes to ability to deny of service to gays and the like. However, if a company fires someone for homophobic speech motivated not even by personal emotions but their business interests (implicitly by emotions of their clients) this is also, in fact, private discrimination but conservatives consider it oppression and privileges... *"A quiet hint to Conservatives.—That which we did not know formerly, and know now, or might know if we chose,—is the fact that a retrograde formation, a reversion in any sense or degree, is absolutely impossible. We physiologists, at least, are aware of this. But all priests and moralists have believed in it,—they wished to drag and screw man back to a former standard of virtue. Morality has always been a Procrustean bed. Even the politicians have imitated the preachers of virtue in this matter. There are parties at the present day whose one aim and dream is to make all things adopt the crab-march. But not everyone can be a crab. It cannot be helped: we must go forward,—that is to say step by step further and further[...] We can hinder this development, and by so doing dam up and accumulate degeneration itself and render it more convulsive, more volcanic: we cannot do more." (F. Nietzsche, The twilight of the idols, Skirmishes in a war with the age, 43)*

So, what's after all should be considered genuine liberalism? Given inconsistency of the left and conservatives on the way of personal freedom, and also taking into account my understanding of liberty as the freedom from "spiritual", I'm forced to conclude that liberalism as solid philosophical and political doctrine of personal freedom has never existed. Despite it having succeeded in the West more than wherever, this vector of its movement has rather implemented unconsciously as a result of the confrontation conservative and egalitarian ideas. Paradoxically, I see the most consistent liberals in such an anti-liberal and having deeply opposite mindset country as Russia. After all, everything has a reverse side, and perhaps only among this plebeian yet messianic mentality the most radical (in other words, consistent) liberalism as the idea could be born (even though in small quantity). Perhaps, it's related to the same thing that makes it anti-free – the eastern irrationalism adopted by Byzantium and inherited by Russia. Eastern religions, as have been said, came to the idea of emptiness and nothingness in the most explicit way and contained a sort of nihilism towards the objective world. Therefore nihilism in this country is more radical. On the other hand, orthodox christianity, as well as eastern religions, more frequently resorted to the subjective that contributed to the religious disease and also made idealism more explicit. Western rationalism, however, had an edge of sorts, so rejection of morality and "higher sense" was rather gradual (although also more effective), idealism and nihilism were more moderate without much of a polarization. In this regard, Merezhkovsky's words come in mind: *"Your genius is moderations, ours is excessiveness. You're able to stop in time; reaching the wall you walk around it or go back; we bash our head against the wall. We're hard to be moved but as we moved we can't be restrained – we don't go but run, don't run but fly, don't fly but fall and always «head over heels» as Dostoevsky said. You like the middle; we like ends. You are sober, we are drunk. You are reasonable, we are delirious; you are just, we are lawless. You're saving your soul; we're always looking something to lose it for. You "have continuing city", we "seek one to come". You, at the last milestone of your freedom, are yet statists; we, in the depths of our slavery, have almost never ceased to be rebels, hidden anarchists – and now hidden just became clear. For you, politics is knowledge, for us, it's religion."*

Toleration.

Not their love of humanity, but the impotence of their love, prevents the Christians of today - burning us. (F. Nietzsche, Beyond good and evil)

while, therefore, the democratising of Europe will tend to the production of a type prepared for slavery in the most subtle sense of the term: the strong man will necessarily in individual and exceptional cases, become stronger and richer than he has perhaps ever been before - owing to the unprejudicedness of his schooling, owing to the immense variety of practice, art, and disguise. (F. Nietzsche, Beyond good and evil)

While paganism was characterized by human struggle against the outer world, forces and nature outside, monotheistic religions take a look at human being and struggle against instincts, nature inside. Human being has still been too much of an animal and felt inferior for their animality. Christianity says: “You are not your body, you are your spirit”. Spirit is essentially mind. That is, true human is not human in the flesh but human which is just spirit, pure mind. “I think, therefore I am” – Descartes later said. Thereof also come all these religious self-flagellation to tame the flesh, castration etc. That is, first humans oppose outer world and paganism has place with all the spirits existing sort of outside. Further the issue of survival gets less urgent and we've got the spirit, i.e. “god” particle in human being themselves, triad god where one part is a god which is also a son human. Christianity gives rise to secular humanism, formally anti-religious but promoting the same values. As Stirner notes, humanism swaps subject and predicate, and christian “god is love” becomes humanist “love is divine” (as for love, this is essentially pursuit of a non-existent ideal). But A is A. Thus, religious values become “universal human” ones. From now on the sufficiently moral isn't one who is a god believer or living in accordance with divine norms, saving their soul but the one who meets the criteria of “human” in general, “universal human values”, and the one who doesn't is “morally corrupt”, “emotional cripple”, “subhuman” etc. So, human becomes spirit in the flesh, the place of the old theology is taken by psychology, psychoanalysis (“psycho” comes from the Greek word “soul”, nothing new again, another casuistic deciding which “soul” is right and which is not), even the idea of the collective consciousness is formed.

Relocation of god to human being gives also born to existentialism, the less collectivist variation of leftism. Actually Kierkegaard didn't deny the christian essence if the doctrine he founded. Reasoning in line with medieval christianity with its ideas of innocence and ignorance (“be ye as innocent as doves”), he called on to return from the tree of knowledge to the tree of life implying the story of Adam and Eva expelled from paradise for starting to think. In case of the conflict of faith and mind he taught to choose the former. And gave the method – take the “leap of faith” with the willpower. Though, Heidegger's dasin, which is in fact just a more vague formulation of god, is separated from subject and attributed with objective existence involved in the world. But, nevertheless, that's nothing but an “omnipresent god”. Thus, the place of the old Marxism and collectivism was taken by subjectivism that became the basis which the “new left” idea was formed upon. Primary narrative of the subjectivism is that any opinion is correct. Now various conservatives are trying to ascribe this idea to post-modernism but this, in my opinion, is not really correct. Post-modernism is more wide concept that spans culture in all its manifestations, and conservatives are as much as the leftists being part of it. Existentialism, phenomenology and other subjectivist concepts were developing amidst the popularity of freudism, psychoanalysis, growth of individualism, there also contributed general disappointment of the European left in USSR, as reaction grew therein, and defeat of fascism; there appeared Husserl, Camus (who despite of suggesting to reject god, said that people should give their love completely to humanity, and thereby made a crowd some sort of a supreme being) and others. Philosophy generally turns from the outer world to inner one, it is yet obsessed with the absolute, “divine”, and since god “moved” from heaven into human being, the absolute, divine truth is now sought in the person and their inner world, «transcendental Ego”. “Kingdom of god is inside us” (L. Tolstoy) Subjectivism has shifted the focus from crowd to a single person. While Feuerbach got "homo homini deus est", here's rather "homo sibi deus est" (but not yet "homo deus est" or "ego deus sum"). That is, person themselves or “something” in the person declared in some extent unknowable. If it were “ego deus sum”, then “Ego” as a god would not supposed to have any limitation in cognition. Here's, however, person is yet a god over self.

Actually, toleration is nothing but christian “love for one's neighbor”. Jesus says in sermon on the mount: *“And if anyone wants to sue you and take your shirt, hand over your coat as well. If anyone forces you to go one mile, go with them two miles. Give to the one who asks you, and do not turn away from the one who wants to borrow from you.”(Mat. 5:40-42)* – so, the most politically correct leftists kneel before the black people and apologize to Indians. The bottom line here is to take the blame like mythological Jesus. In fact, christianity is a religion of guilt, according to it, mankind bears the mark of the original sin and even their very existence it was supposed to atone. Among consistent/radical (actually, being “radical” means being consistent) leftists it can easily take such forms as the guilt for being white. All this is christian narrative, the narrative of guilt. Doesn't matter what the guilt for, whether for personal “sinfulness” or past lives deeds like for Indians, or for racism of the ancestors, or for colonialism, the only presence of guilt matters. «God is dead but god is still white», and here are now calls to depict Jesus black. Well, George Floyd is the quite worthy substitute. Both are lumpens, so to speak. And who were apostles and companions of Jesus? Fishermen, publicans, harlots... meaning the foremost revered figures of christianity aren't the most decent representatives of Jewish society of I century (among first followers of prophet Muhammad, there also were many poor and oppressed, including women and slaves). Publican, for example is a person who collected taxes for Romans, something like “fascist collaborator” if I am to pick relatively modern analogy. But villains of the past are heroes of the present and vice versa. *“That which an age considers evil is usually an unseasonable echo of what was formerly considered good - the atavism of an old ideal.” (F. Nietzsche)*

Toleration or political correctness is, therefore, being the next stage of the development of christian morality (and religious morality in general) which is now formed. In that very moment when the idea that god in the human being and not outer world is formed, christianity starts off to transit into its opposite, spiral of history makes its full revolution turning into humanist negation of christianity (yet being logical continuation of it). This is also something close to Hegel's Aufheben. This is global inevitable process, opponents of toleration, including various conservative christians, for the most part, don't realize the magnitude of what happening or the essence of things they believe in. I think toleration gives ultimately more individual freedom of action but it makes love for one's neighbor almost obligation willing to make everyone a Jesus-ling depriving even the right for indifference. As they like to say now: “it's not enough to be neutral”. Toleration doesn't make an individual free and should eventually be overcome. This in no way means return to the values of the past, toleration is after all more preferable than “traditional values”. Keeping up it also negates. This is the same principle as always. It's possible to go forward, it's possible to stand still (but just for a while, until the wind of history blows off), “traditional values” are the standing still. Ultimately, everything leads to the same result, just along the longer spiral way. The straight way sure would be more preferable but there are certain “centrifugal forces” lying in moral habit, indoctrination of the “intellectual majority”, their irrationality and so on.

Why are we the right?

With these preachers of equality will I not be mixed up and confounded. For thus speaketh justice unto me: "Men are not equal." And neither shall they become so! What would be my love to the Superman, if I spake otherwise? (F. Nietzsche, Thus Spoke Zarathustra)

Conservatives reading this apparently think the author is leftists, and leftists probably think vice versa. So, I'll make it clear here. For starters, it is to be decided what should be considered right and what's left. It's clear that these terms are completely arbitrary, just like “positive” and “negative” charges on the electrodes. Originally the concepts were based on the distribution of seats in the French parliament. Ones sitting on the right were for saving monarchy and the old order, ones sitting on the left were for separation church and state, abolishment of classes. But the “old order” can be very different, depending on the current moment of time and historical context. For Russia,

for example, the old order is soviet regime. According to this logic, communists are supposed to be considered right which looks quite absurd. For the objective criteria, the constant should be found. Nationalists and social conservatism proponents are often referred to as the right. But here is inconsistency also seen in reality. As was noted earlier, social conservatism prevailed primarily in the countries of the socialist block while capitalist West went along the way of progress. Romania of Ceausescu was very nationalistic, as well as China. And take as an example that the contemporary leftists quite agree with religious obscurantists on the idea of prohibition of prostitution and pornography. If we compare a catholic nun, who fights sexualized characters in video games because those are "amoral", and a left sjw pseudo-feminist who fights the same thing but on the pretext of imaginary "objectification of women" there is no much difference. Actually this is even the same personality type. Moreover, terf are also transphobic, being no different from traditionalist housewives. And why are the left trying to hog up the term "progressives"? The left and progress are mutually exclusive concepts. Another fundamental criteria is that the left are for equality and the right are for hierarchy. Well, first of all, even the left have never had a non-hierachical system. Secondly, it has to be made clear – equality in what and hierarchy based on what? Usually, by equality the material equality is understood which is absurd since people aren't equal. In this regard, dialectical immoralism certainly stands for hierarchy. But hierarchy should not be based on some moldy moral dogmas, fossils of tradition, patriarchal and social prejudices, etc.
"On a thousand bridges and piers shall they throng to the future, and always shall there be more war and inequality among them: thus doth my great love make me speak!"(F. Nietzsche)
So, if some left support same freedoms that I do, we still have different basis – theirs is universal equality and love for one's neighbor, mine is individual freedom and egoism. Freedom and equality are mutually exclusive concepts. Former is the ability to exercise one's own egoistic will (see corresponding chapter for details), it's struggle, free competition, movement due to inequality. Latter is diminishing differences, moderation in everything, stagnation, lack of movement. *"Co-existing of the two mutually conflicting sides, their fight and merge into new category is the essence of dialectical movement. One who aims at elimination of a bad side thereby solely terminates dialectical movement" (K. Marx, The poverty of philosophy)* Also Marx be like: "capitalism should be eliminated and dictatorship of proletariat established". Just kidding, the latter is said by marxists, not Marx. I understand he meant different thing, however communism is yet portrayed as an end of any struggle (therefore Marx had to make a disclaimer representing communism as process, not a goal, in order to reconcile communism with dialectic – I'll be back on this later).
While the first criteria is not completely fit to be universal one, the second is, though far-fetched in a degree, and we are right on it. But Nolan chart, in my opinion, expresses it in the best way, with it having the right as economic freedom proponents and the left as regulation and redistribution proponents, and authoritarianism - anti- authoritarianism being positioned perpendicularly. So, if we transform Nolan's "matrix" into the "vector" <left, right>, we are exactly the right. After all, regulation and redistribution requires having certain authority, regulator, some degree of enforcement and authoritarianism. Conservatives and leftists in their extremes are similar to each other – horseshoe theory in action. Both are display of plebeian thinking. On this ground, populism and national-socialism can actively thrive. But, I think, nowhere yet existed pure "capitalist cosmopolitanism", for example, that is, progressivism under the aegis of inequality. Because it has aristocratic essence. This is exactly what dialectical immoralism represents. We can be described as the "progressive right". What I call progressive right, if making it completely plain, can be described as combination and reconciliation the conventionally "left" and "right"political currents by integration of their best ideas and dismissing their drawbacks: From the right we take elitism, aristocracy, free market and hierarchy between people; from the left is atheism, materialism, anti-traditionalism and cosmopolitanism. No to social justice and cultural identity.

Collectivism.

From the aforementioned, it's supposed to be already clear that main enemy of personal freedom is collectivism. Precisely it, in all its manifestations, should be eradicated. It has been said earlier about its animal and evolutionary basis, its role in the past and irrelevance at the present, so I won't repeat myself, say again only that collectivism is the most ancient, primitive form of the living creatures organization and their thinking (when it takes place). Merging their individual self in the herd or corporative thinking, in society, collectivist considers neither self nor others as stand-alone independent individuals. This is the basis for various gods like fatherland, society, nature (as an object of worship) and just religious god being formed, these are consequently being pillars for morality, collective traditions and norms. Religions have actively cultivated this state of merge in the collective, god. For example, the essence of muslim hajj is precisely to make people feel themselves particles of community. All pilgrims dress in the same clothes that eliminate any class differences and move in the same direction. Any form of collectivism, be it patriotism, communism or something else requires from a single person some degree of sacrifice in the name of "supreme being" or "sacred cause". One might wonder, why someone need to do this? Collectivism obtains its proponents among those most mediocre, miserable and deplorable Homo which ain't really Sapiens and who has primitive animal traits expressed particularly prominent. Without affiliation to the herd they feel vulnerable and alienated. Identifying themselves with their whole clan (be that people in general, nation, gender/sex or other collective identity) such a person would perceive actions of others almost as if those were his own actions, so if someone insults the collective communion it would be perceived as a personal insult. Therefore, for a homophobe who is a special case of a (heterosexual) collectivist, the knowledge of someone being fucked in the ass amounted to him or whole his "clan" being fucked in the ass, same for all other violation of group morality and social norms. In essence, this is form of identification and empathy. Actually, empathy is not also needed and should be eradicated because it gives rise to various defenders of offended feelings who are trying to include their feelings in the category of "freedom" and their defense in the category of "right".

Deconctruction of collectivism is not easy with it existing even in relatively small groups like parties and fractions in parliament, and can also be used as a tool to fight more primitive and collectivist groups. Therefore its liquidation should be steady and carried out basing on dialectical principles. One layer after another should be taken off, peeling further from more vast forms of collective identity to smaller and more fragmented ones. Moreover, uniformity of the process should be kept in order for more atomistic and developed groups not to be superseded or assimilated by less atomistic and more primitive ones. So, for starters, collectivism should be most actively destroyed where it's most prominent and where it's geopolitically profitable for the progressive forces.

As have been said, society doesn't exist, it's just an abstraction, there are individuals only. But perhaps someone, in line with buddhists, might say that everything is abstraction, and if we sequentially make decomposition of a person or refrigerator it would turn to be that they don't exist and there are just atoms. However, if we take use of one of dialectical materialism principle – passing of quantity into quality, we have to admit that functionality of a whole is supposed to be greater than that if its parts. Life is a higher form of inanimate matter organization. Intelligence is the highest one ("the highest form of movement" as it used to be said). Refrigerator exists because its functionality as a whole is greater than that of its parts. Person exists for same reason. If we compare so called "society" and individuals who constitute it, we have to admit that society per se doesn't have intelligence or at least less intelligent than individuals. As Terry Pratchett said: *"The intelligence of that creature known as a crowd is the square root of the number of people in it."* Therefore society doesn't exist.

Feminization

Some, in large part conservative fans of patriarchy, sometimes speak of "feminization" happening.

Well, actually yes, if using patriarchy determinated cultural labels about what's being “feminine” and “masculine”, it really does, perhaps on deeper level than those who usually speak of it thinks, and in some subtle sense future is female. Firstly, in the cognition vector itself. Since antiquity the two major direction pf philosophy have formed, one searched the truth outside the person, in the outside wold, another did it inside the person, in their inside world, feelings and the like. Partially, this perhaps correlates with what Nietzsche called Apollonian and Dionysian origins. So, men more often have thinking focused on the “outside” while women have one focused “inside” – the same thing is inherent to contemporary subjectivist philosophy.
Secondly, the subjectivism itself, focus on feelings fueled by existentialism, phenomenology and the similar religiously psychological casuistic.
Thirdly, this is sort of victimization and the transformation of weakness into strength, lobbying one's interests from victim's position. This is also very christian and more often seen (for instance, the nature of revolutionary process in Belarus now), in this regard, sermon on the mount comes to my mind right away: *“Blessed are you when people insult you, persecute you, and falsely say all kinds of evil against you[...] Rejoice and be glad, because great is your reward in heaven; for in the same way they persecuted the prophets before you[...] But I tell you not to resist an evil person. If someone slaps you on your right cheek, turn to him the other also;” (Mat. 5:11-12, 39) “Blessed are the meek, for they will inherit the earth.” (Mat. 5:5)*
On the other hand, christianity can be considered as rise of the Apollonian and the masculine. In christianity, feminine was deemed to be physical and masculine was spiritual. Women were considered by christianity as a tool of devil. For example, Thomas Aquinas wrote of this (Tavard,p.125). Eve was seen as a culprit of the fall of man. In this regard, Tertullian (the one who promoted the idea of innocence and said “I believe because it is absurd”) says in his writing “On women's dress” that as long as world exists Eve is one to blame. Speaking to a woman he says: *“you are the one who unseals the curse of that tree, and you are the first one to turn your back on the divine law; you are the one who persuaded him whom the devil was not capable of corrupting; you easily destroyed the image of God, Adam. Because of what you deserve, that is, death, even the Son of God had to die.”(Tertullian, p.345)* Augustine echoes him: *“There is no difference if she is wife or mother, it's the same Eve the temptress who man should beware of in any woman.*” (Augustine, Letters, 243:10)* Augustine also wondered why god had to create woman because *“if Adam needed a company of a good fellow, it would be better to have two male friends getting along instead of man and woman*”(Augustine, The literal commentary on Genesis, IX:5.9)* Although, this is what was promoted by “state christianity” – the christianity of the later Rome, Byzantium – that further incorporated certain antique and stoic ideas. But purified of other accumulations the “core” of christianity is yet rather leftist. In antiquity, for instance, masculinity is certainly higher, there was some misogyny and active role was superior to passive one, but at the same time antiquity didn't reject physicality. Church created on base of this a fierce idiosyncrasy in line with national-socialism (conditionally taking antique ethics as “brown” and the christian as “red”). Socialism, the left idea, completely formalizes essence of christianity, and, in this regard, it's being sort of “feminine”. There are somewhat more leftists among women, after all. But this is of course the prearranged, patriarchy determined division, and not an immanent feature of gender. After all, existence determines consciousness, so in severe conditions of ancient times where the strength played the leading role, having formed hierarchy based on patriarchy that existed up until recently and partially still does, the left or christian ideas that appeal to weakness and humanitarianism were supposed to resonate primarily with disadvantaged and oppressed categories of population. If conditions being so that person more effectively reaches their goals from a position of weakness or appealing to humanity, compassion and so on, they'll form a corresponding perception of the world. This trend of notional “feminization” is eventually the mere antithesis of patriarchy, which is also to be overcome, transitioning into the new quality. So to speak, thesis, antithesis – synthesis.

“Dehumanization”? Why not.

Man is something that shall be overcome.(F. Nietzsche)
"Dead are all the gods: now do we desire the overman to live."—Let this be our final will at the great noontide!(F. Nietzsche, Thus, Spoke Zarathustra)
"Listen, I tell you a mystery: We will not all sleep, but we will all be changed"(1Cor. 15:51)

For the proponents of christian morality, "universal human values" Nietzsche is a nihilist, Nietzsche himself, though, called christians nihilists. In fact there's no inconsistency and both claims are valid. Everything depends on what's being at the center. For Nietzsche, it is "the meaning of the earth" i.e. the material, physiological, therefore christians whose "kingdom is not of this world", who deny the material and mortal flesh are nihilists, life deniers for him. For christians or humanists, Nietzsche is a nihilist as a denier of their ideal and values.
On the one hand, christianity also aims to overcome the human nature but its ideal always remains mere christian, too human, just an inferiority complex for their own nature. Nietzsche, though getting back to the "meaning of the earth", the material, in line with his time, at the same time declares the Ubermensch as something inherently anti-christian. Thereby well reflecting the dialectical principle of negation of the negation.

Once I came across an article of some conservatives/Nazies where the author was whining about "dehumanization", taking as examples such good things as egoism, depravity, consumer society, feminism, children picking their gender etc. Whom do they actually understand by "human"? The humanist concept of human, "homo moralis". And yes, "dehumanization" does happen – as the elimination of "homo moralis" apart other things. Not even despite, but because of christianity. A christian (in the broadest sense of the word) aims to liberate themselves from the world, build the "kingdom that is not of this world", get rid off suffering and reach eternal bliss. Actually, this is not the feature of solely christianity but that of all primary religions, as have been mentioned. Dehumanization is ultimately determined by the essence of christianity itself. *"Even being humans is wearisome for us – the human beings with our real body and blood; ashamed of that, see it embarrassing and willing to be some unprecedented common humans*"(Dostoevsky, Notes from the Underground).* A christian doesn't want to be the flesh or human, they want to be a spirit – the "humane human" which is a concept of human. In order to reach this, christianity has to transition to its opposite. A christian invented the totalitarian god to "subdue the flesh". Christianity taught people meekness, humility, innocence, moderation, self-neglecting. But christian god is an egoist that acts as it's willing to. God is supercilious, bitchy and narcissistic (after all, according to the bible, it created humans in its own image, and it's said more explicitly in koran that god created Adam to behold itself mirrored). Human being which is the perfect spirit, which is the pure intelligence is meant to implement god in themselves. *"For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways," declares the Lord. "As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts.(Isaiah, 55:8-9).* So shall an individual speak! Christianity, traditional values start off with denying egoism but humanism by returning god into human being returns them egoism as well. Consistent implementation of the love to one's neighbor leads to humanism, toleration and personal freedom which deny christianity. Personal freedom, however, leads to individualism and egoism which are to transcend toleration. Transcending toleration means transcending feelings, human nature to become their master. Transcend doesn't mean suppress like christianity in its heyday did, this means free disposal of feelings as the property. Here's unity and conflict of opposites, dialectical materialism. Eventually, the Self substitutes god and becomes the center making person self-centered, absorbed in self-reflection – self-absorbed, thereby a righteous man is supposed to become a self-righteous man. Theologists who were willing to dissolve their Selves in god oftentimes got the opposite result, the assertion of the higher-level Selves, for example, al Bistami says: *"I looked at Allah with the eye of truth and said Him: "Who are you?" And He answered: "I'm nothing but Me. There is no god except Me". And then, He sort of substituted me with Himself. […] And I spoke to Him with His*

own tongue, saying on His behalf: "How did it happen that I became You?" And He answered: "I'm in You to the core; there is no other god except You" (Marshall G.S. Hodgson, The Venture of Islam, Conscience and History in a World Civilization) Maximus the Confessor wrote: *"Man is supposed to entirely become God, become divine by the grace of God who became man and true human, in soul and body by nature, and true God in soul and body – by epiphany"(Difficult Passages)* Here is important to avoid escapism and subjectivist solipsism. It should be self-centeredness and self-absorbedness precisely as egoism based on objectivism, freed from feelings, and not the escape from reality and detachment from the world or irrational faith in the world created by human senses. Both commies and fascists share the dislike to "consumer society". But doesn't humanism aims to get rid off suffering? Didn't they want "to each according to his need"? The red-brown (tankies, alt-rights etc.) moan like oh, liberalism dehumanizes, erases collective identity, edge between genders, and contrast traditional values to it. But spirit is free from flesh and not limited by one particular gender, so humanity is supposed to liberate themselves from gender and become genderless. So, yes, let the edge to be erased, let the mankind become genderless. In the original text of the bible, the meaning is that human beings were created androgynous.*"So God created mankind in his own image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them"(Gen.1:27)* – this is how this verse usually sounds in English translation, so is it translated in most of European languages. But this is nonsense because from the further narration we see that female is created later, in Genesis 2:22, out of the proverbial rib. The formulation in the original Hebrew text can be conditionally translated as "male woman", "female man", "shemale". Thus, the first man was a trap according to the bible. Now live with it. Actually not just according to the bible, myths about androgynous beings that were later divided had existed in Ancient Greece (the word "rib" in the original text also means "side", that is as well an argument in favor of the myth about androgyny, since that time androgynous beings were depicted having two sides, two faces etc.) Plus, it's said that mankind was created in the image of god, so god was shemale, too. Here's the original text of this verse: וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים | אֶת ־ הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם
נְקֵבָה – female, woman
זָכָר – male, man
אֵת – definitive object, not translated.
Additionally, the word "Adam" itself is not just a name, with article it also means "human being". Many nations used to think (and some still do) that sort of angelic nature is expressed in people who had a need to express themselves in both male and female role, or it was believed that they contained two souls, male and female. Such people used to be considered superior to those who are tightly anchored to one particular gender. Androgyny was, in fact, an expression of the world's harmony. Bigender traits can be seen in iconography of many nations. For example, bearded Aphrodite and Aphrodite with male genitalia. Ancient Greeks used to honor, among other gods, Hermaphroditus — the son of Hermes and Aphrodite. Priests and shamans might resort to the ritual bisexuality or wear female clothes thereby engaging in the transcendental, the divine, and reach integrity amalgamating two opposite principles – male and female, cosmos and chaos, heaven and earth... This is, in fact, deeply dialectical idea. In this sense, my philosophy is androgynous, too, if we notionally take the conventional left idea as "female" and conventional right (conservative, to be exact) one as "male". Religious feasts of ancient Greeks also had similar practices. By M. Eliade: *"Change of clothes through religious experience aims to reach some sort of the state of androgyny, return to the original human state that was considered perfect in all traditions. Person wearing women's clothes didn't become a woman but he for a while embodied the unity of genders – the state which facilitated him certain conceptualization of Cosmos integrity.*"* Actually, modern LGBTQIA+ prides is in large part being analogous to Roman Saturnalia and perhaps partially Bacchanalia (the negative meaning to the word was ascribed by christianity as well). *"The one who knows their masculinity and keeps their femininity is the original chaos of the world.*"* is said about androgynous being in the Tao Te Ching. Geometric variation of androgynous being is the symbol yin and yang as well as the double-headed eagle. In Ancient Egypt this symbol was known as Dual Rebis and often depicted as double-headed king. Later the symbol was actively used in

masonry (I guess if Russian parliamentarians know this they'll replace the eagle with one-headed one). In Kabbala, the magical figure Macroprosopus is androgynous. Nietzsche considered the nature of genius feminine, and taking into account that he criticized certain feminine egalitarian traits, one might guess a premature idea of androgyny. Plutarch says that *"Moon is called the mother of cosmos since it is belied to reconcile male and female origins.*" (Plut. De Is. et Os. 43).* Dionysus, with being a dying and resurrecting god of fertility, has lunar symbolism, first, he's a horned god who always has snakes around. He is one who became a prototype of Satan (and satyrs, respectively, demons). Among early christian theologians, there had also been proponents of the androgyny concept, for example, gnostics and Origen (who, by the way, castrated himself). Origen believed that theoria (contemplation) gives a soul knowledge about god, transforms it to the original divinity, and eventually everyone will get out of the prison of body, lose sex characteristics and become a pure spirit again. This idea is also supported by Judean interpretors (in my opinion, Jews anyway better know how the original text in Hebrew should be understood). Given that human being is created in the bible "in the image of god" it is apparently also assumed to have bigender nature. The name Yahweh is decyphered into two components – male Jah and female Hovah. As well as angels. Actually, it can be denoted that the term "angels" sometimes identical to "god". To be exact, the word "elohim" i.e. "gods" is used in the original text. Angels=gods. When angels visit Abraham and later on when he tried to negotiate righteous men in Sodom, he speaks to one of those angels as to god. Additionally, there is rather strange episode where Sodom inhabitants tried to rape an angel. Patriarchal theologists later started to assume gender of angels as male and claim on this basis that Sodom was destroyed for "sodomy", despite this is not explicitly stated anywhere in the bible (the word translated as "men" may mean just "people", just like in English). Their androgyny is implicitly pointed out in the New Testament, Matthew 22:30: *"At the resurrection people will neither marry nor be given in marriage; they will be like the angels in heaven."* Yes, supposedly the word "angels" itself means "messenger" which barely, however, meant that they were sent by some sort of personified god. "Angel of god" rather means that the divine which contained in everything is expressed through them, therefore they are yet identical to god in a way. Just like "son of god" didn't originally meant a direct kinship and just pointed to a tight relation to divinity. By "divine", something incomprehensible and alien was understood. As well as the word "saint" (kaddosh) had nothing to do with morality and ethical excellence but meant otherness, complete strangeness. N. Berdyaev wrote: *"Neither man nor woman is the image of God but mere an androgynous being, the integral person. Differentiation of male and female is the result of the cosmic fall of Adam. Creation of Eve got old Adam under the power of generic sexuality. Chained him to natural "world", "this world". The "world" caught Adam and owns him through the sex, at the point of sexuality Adam is chained to natural necessity. Eve's power over Adam became a whole nature's power over him. Human linked to Eve who gives birth became a slave of nature, a slave of femininity separated, differentiated from his androgynous image and likeness of God. Man tries to restore his androgynous image through his sex drive to the lost female nature.*"* Androgyny is essentially the culmination of egoism of a free individual who trampled through their unbreakable will any dependence of others – absence of the need for anyone due to embodiment of opposites in themselves. Famous German doctor Ritter claimed that humans of the future were supposed to be androgynous. Another German philosopher, doctor, naturalist Franz von Baader echoes him: *"Androgynous being has existed primordially and will appear again in the end of time. The goal of marriage as sacrament is the restitution of angelic image of humans how it's supposed to be. Love between sexes is not to be confused with the procreation instinct. A true its purpose is to help man and woman to restore in them the complete and integral primal human image*".* As for the end of time, I'll add from me that it's more correct to speak about the end of christian time or, more broadly, "the end of human". About 30 years ago, Fukuyama declared "the end of history" with having liberal democracy as the final form, but this is rather yet the end of christian, humanist history and it's yet going to come in this century, and be expressed in the triumph of toleration. This in fact corresponds to the Nietzschean period of "last man" which is supposed to be followed by overman. Somewhere on this stage humanity may take a step to the genderless state, and further

subsequent disposal of the “human” is theoretically possible. Dugin seemed to somewhere say speaking of liberalism that all this lead to humanity becomes cyborgs. But he said it as a sort of scary story while I'd say – so be it! Why not? Let it be even digital spirit if this increases its freedom and power. You, christians, wanted this themselves. You fought for it and you're hurt from it. Although, cyborgs are yet too far away, but genetic engineering and eugenics in the long run really can give ample opportunity. As Nietzsche wrote, man is as a rope stretched between the ape and the superhuman. Perhaps once this rope will break, and mankind end up separated into different species like apes and humans have once split up. I think we also get rid off one day of such a savage relic as childbearing and people will be breded in vials. Human evolution is based on the improvement of tools, this is the basis of their survival, so if some artificial modifications or cybernetic upgrades strengthen their position, to the extend of immortality (as far this concept can make sense in the material existence), why not, then. I think human will once be perceived like an ape is now. Like now one may say about some Allah fans: “fuck, what the monkeys...”, similarly one will say about someone: “shit, what a Homo Sapiens...” Even now, starting with a certain level, some highly prim**a**tive, collectivist, irrational persons cannot be perceived anyhow but as subhumans. As for immortality, sometimes various journalist gossips of scientists promising immortality in this century can be heard, but that's slim chance, moreover it would be a catastrophe. Such things are spread from the top down, and this would foremost mean that, for example, Putin or Kim Jong Un would never diem this would stop any development, not mention a demographic catastrophe. No one would even think of giving it out to everyone. This requires a way higher level of development than average human one, way less inertia of mind and higher production rate. Now this issue is dealt rather as residual, but in a certain moment in the future, as essential potential will be accumulated, it is possible in some form, as well as exploitation of other planets, for example.

So, building on the previous reasoning, I come to conclusion that even though christianity (in particular but not just it) had a quite swell goal of “dehumanization”, it was yet way too human, too ape and, hence, wasn't very successful at this. For complete success, it has to evolve, dwindle into its opposite. *“Suicide of morality is the last moral demand!” (F. Nietzsche)* Actually, I've been always attracted to the future in line with an unspiritual cyberpunk as objectively the most right one. So called “humanity”, emotions, empathy, irrationality, spirituality and the like should be overcome and the individual should rise above them. “Humanity” is an echo of prim**a**tivness, and most of Homo Sapiens are still too highly prim**a**tive, too subjective. Ontologiness and humanity are mutually exclusive. The maximal objectivity is reached on precisely the loss of what usually called “human”. Humanity spoils any good idea, poisons all endeavor reducing them to the ape level which is called “traditional values”, “social justice” etc. God is dead. Let also nature die under the pressure of the technogenic artificial environment! Let society die, so that an individual be liberated from the oppression of the collective! So, long live the posthuman!

Untermenschen.

Full is the earth of the superfluous; marred is life by the many-too-many. May they be decoyed out of this life by the "life eternal"! Many too many are born: for the superfluous ones was the state devised! (F. Nietzsche, Thus Spoke Zarathustra)

Who may be considered subhumans? For the objective estimation, it's better to estimate similarities between human being and its predecessor – an ape. An ape is objectively highly subhuman. Collectivism, commitment to social conventions (conservatism, backwardness, in other words), primacy pf instincts and emotions over intelligence and rationality, authoritarian-submissive relations can all be attributed to the similarities. Isn't it logical? It is. Monkeys also have the sense of justice (proved by experiments). Respectively, the more these characteristics of primates are prominent in someone the closer they are to the concept of “subhuman”. It's clear that barely they are absent in someone in 100%, however the vector precisely like this, from higher prim**a**tivness to

the lower. Highly prim**a**tive traits are most prominent among sheeple, plebians, rabble. Since this vector implies movement towards the decrease of prim**a**tive features, the anti-collectivist, anti-authoritarian, individualist and egoist (not directed to reach fairness) model should be taken as a guideline. And given that the concept of the "humanity" used to develop primarily in the left collectivist christian-humanistic discourse, in fact this means that the less "human" the further from subhuman and closer to superhuman. Nietzsche by and large understood untermensch precisely this way, as an aristocratic archetype who rose above the human and breaks the old tables of values. Since he often referred to antiquity in his reasoning, this leads many, especially conservatives, to the misunderstanding that he called for return to antique order, however, taking into account the general idea, it's clear that it rather was just an illustration of an elitist model. Apparently Nazis were led to the same misconception, given that they used Nietzschean ubermensch in purely christian-humanistic collectivist way and, respectively, the antonym "untermensch" they used was merely an opposite to the christian humanistic ideal. In fact, the idea was turned upside down. Objectively, in accordance with the logic of the original Nietzschean idea, however, proponents of traditional values, fairness, morality, generally ones driven by emotions and having prim**a**tive traits and herd thinking should be considered untermenschen. There are especially many of them in authoritarian countries like Russia (that's essentially why they're authoritarian). With being collectivist semi-apes, these untermenschen are the most ardent defenders of traditions, generally accepted norms, taboos and values. How to deal with them depends eventually on particular circumstances. If they just exist and not being obstacle to the progressive transformation there is no need to restrict them anyhow – let them use freedom in the extent they're able to, there is no need to force them to meet a certain standard like communists or Nazis tried to instill humanistic ideal to everyone. After all, nobody compels a pig to use tableware. But if they are being the active enemies of freedom and egoism, any effective measures are to be taken to neutralize them. In this regard, it would be silly to think that some deplorables lives matter in the same extent as the lives of proud free thinkers and right honorable masters the egoists. How can they be considered equal, after all? Collectivist aggressive lumpen rabble have not much to lose and their quantity is more than excessive. And, of course, such subhumans should not determine state's policy or way of social development.

Historical context

In the previous chapters, I considered the change of the basic idea, the source of any morality by itself. Naturally, however, these changes was inherently tied to the development of civilization and change in the way of life. So, here I consider this aspect briefly. Social progress in large part has always gone side by side with technical one, the issues of welfare and security of the human community. Generally, if we look back and cover the development of human civilization altogether, following tendencies may be noted: humanity has been on the way of increase of the rate of production, it has been on the way from absolutism and primacy of the state over an individual to the personal freedom, from collectivism to individualism, from interests of the herd to the interests of an individual.

Several important periods may be distinguished on this way:

0) **The primitive**. Means of production are virtually absent, people live in small isolated tribes, high dependence from outer environment, the concept of individuality barely exists. Philosophical ideas, mindset as such don't exist yet, there are rituals – prototype of religion. Gradually agriculture and pastoralism are formed. Priests take the top of hierarchy, those are ones who can successfully imitate communication with "gods", can "cause" rain, lucky hunt and the like. Given the high dependence from outer environment this was an urgent need.

1) **Despotic.** In the conditions where means of production are very primitive and tied at manual labor, naturally a person becomes the main tool, because one can't do without labor division anyway. In this regard, it's naive to consider slavery as a bad thing or think that rejection of it caused by some sort of "moral growth" of humanity that all of sudden "realized" how it's "bad". It

was normal, economically reasonable phenomena. Someone had to work in field, construct buildings, pyramids and so on. So, it disappeared as soon as became economically unprofitable. Environment in this period is still quite dangerous for person. The central idea is the cult of strength.
This period starts somewhere in Neolithic and lasts till the end of Iron Age. In this period, the system of social relations gets more complicated, as well as hierarchy, first empires, civilizations, writing, money appear. This period ends up with conversion to christianity and Roman Empire disintegration. In the Modern Period, the idea about "barbarians having destroyed Rome" was popularized, but this is rather superficial estimation, things like armies strengthening which chose and toppled emperors at will, strifes for power, as well as christianity, as Gibbon noted, contributed to this much more. Imperial power in Rome wasn't hereditary in most cases, ans emperor was virtually elected by army. The cause wasn't even that Germans infiltrated army (they all considered themselves foremost Romans regardless of heritage), rather that the rabble in general infiltrated therein. Though, at the beginning soldiering was an elites' occupation (who was represented in the senate as well), with the development and labor division it became a craft, an occupation for peasants and other poorly-educated classes of population. Additionally, precisely barbarians converted into the religion of fallen Rome, not vise versa.

2) **Monarchical** (including feudalism). Production rate grows, slave labor becomes unprofitable and gradually peters out being replaced with rather weak serfdom, practice of vassals and other. Generally, an individual gets a little more autonomy. However, manual labor is yet in demand, level of illiterate and rural population is high. The central idea is religion.

Christians like to say that Rome persecuted them for their faith. This is not really true. Rome actually was quite liberal in this regard, deities of conquered nations used to be just included in the Roman pantheon. The only demand was to offer sacrifice to the emperor who was also considered a son of Mars in Rome. Here christians who respected only one god kicked against the pricks. They were repressed for "extremism" – the refusal to offer sacrifice to the emperor who represented overall Roman authority. In fact, only a small number of them were sentenced to death, mostly priests. As have been noted, christianity gained popularity among slaves due to its left ideas. Amount of slaves several times exceeded the amount of citizens in later Rome. Eventually, Rome established its own christianity and the official church from among christians who agreed to collaborate. They rejected part of the original dogmatics melted christian mythology with pagan one together (thus Jesus and New Testament got an official status) and Roman emperor became a high priest – at the church council where "holy spirit descended" emperor had the last word. Today head of the catholic church, the Pope, is also called a pontiff which means "high priest". Before Roman emperor was called this way. Under paganism he was a high priest of Mars, under christianity he became that of christian god. A priest, in fact, is one through whom god "tells" their will to others. The principle "If you can't beat it, lead it" had worked, edited christianity became official religion, other christian sects became a "non-systematic opposition" and eventually dissolved. Of course, after Rome having split, holy spirit told Byzantium emperor slightly different things, so another branch of christianity has appeared. After Roman Empire's collapse, the idea about it had lasted a quite long time, virtually during entire middle ages (the last reference to it is the Holy Roman Empire which is also the First Reich). Despite emergence of various national states, the Pope, pontiff, inherited full power of Roman emperor and had in fact supranational power, could appoint and overthrow kings etc. In a sense, Europe was being confederation or union wherein religion was an integrating power (wars between christian countries barely happened, at least until Reformation, and wars were mostly waged with either vikings or muslims). Crusades were one of ways to expand the sphere of influence. Religious orders had high influence and finances. The church took monopoly in all crucial spheres of human life – birth (baptism), education, health care, marriage (wedding), work (medieval corporations, guilds), death and funeral (last rites). Confession practice gave the full knowledge about citizens' cares, various religious prescriptions regulated all spheres of

life. Since religion was the basis of this supranational power, its dogmas were thoroughly protected, similar to how those not offering sacrifice to Roman emperor were persecuted, likewise now the church persecuted heretics. Anyone who encroached the church monopoly was smeared as devil worshipers,magicians and such. For example, witches. In essence, the problem was not magic itself, would it have even been real, but that they infringed the church monopoly – firstly on health care, secondly on “miracles”. Likewise the state will not allow any serious activity if it's not embedded in the state system (just 20-30 years ago, one might end up with a soldering iron in the ass here). So, person with all their needs had to go to “mother the church”. It doesn't matter either a deed is good or bad, the only matter whether it is under authorities' control, and if person makes good deeds (in the conventional sense of the word) without state sanction in the scale beyond domestic sphere, they won't get away with it. Church also prohibited usury for christians, hence nobody could match the church in wealth, even kings. This prohibition, however, wasn't spread to Jews, so they occupied this niche, eventually forming the banking sector. Naturally, the church disliked this, so there were spread stories about Jews having crucified Christ, how greedy they being and plundering population, riots against Jews had place, they were expelled (from Vienna and Linz in 1421, from Cologne in 1424, from Augsburg in 1439, from Bavaria in 1442 and 1450, from Moravia in 1454, from Perugia in 1485, from Vicenza in 1486, from Parma in 1486, from Milan and Lucca in 1489, from Tuscany in 1494) and so on, so called “blood libel” is actively spread – which is the accusation of Jews killing christian infants to use their blood in the rites. All this eventually led to antisemitism.
Ignorant, obedient, lowly population was beneficial to the church, so it preached innocence and meekness. Like Strugatsky wrote: “We don't need smart, we need the loyal”. The Pope Gregory VII even forbade christians to read the bible. In fact, almost till Reformation the bible existed only in Latin, Greek and Hebrew. Only more or less educated people could read it which wasn't the case for the most of the population, yet, just in case, he forbade it. Church services were also hold in Latin that parishioners did not understand which added mysteriousness and supernaturalism to the action: since everything is incomprehensible, the information is apparently descended “from above” – otherwise people would have comprehended it.

By the time Europe has reached the developed and later feudalism, the most part of the world was yet on the primitive or despotic level, somewhere early feudalism might show up but in general there was serious backlog. Leftists like to say Africa is that poor because it was exploited by Europeans and denuded resources of it, but it's more likely that without them the gap were even larger – it's enough to look at those isolated tribes untouched by civilization which intentionally kept intact due to touristic and anthropological reasons – they stayed on the primitive level of development. The development sure would have gone on anyway, but the most primitive stages are also the most slow. Natural resources aren't meant to admire them, moreover savages didn't even know those existed, had they even known, on their development level those wouldn't have been of value to them. Colonialism certainly accelerated world's development in general and decreased its unevenness. European brought civilization to all corners of the world, developed deposits, brought technologies. Why actually Africans used to became slaves and not, say, Chinese or Indians (from India)? They just were on that stage of the relations of production where slavery is a natural thing. Africans themselves willingly sold their counterparts. Europe itself didn't already need slaves but the New World where wasn't anything, even agriculture, is another matter. For the same reason, later slavery lasted longer on the South of the US – the South was agricultural, the North urbanized and industrial. Also, in order to somehow justify Negroes' status the church promptly found a reason in the bible: when after the great flood Noah got boozed and slept naked in his tent, his son Ham peeked in and told his brothers. For this, Ham's offspring was punished to be slaves of his brothers' offspring, also Ham inherited lands on the territory of modern Ethiopia, on this basis the church deducted that Ham and his offspring had negroid race thus explaining slavery. How Noah could give birth sons of different races was not specified. Later, freed slaves who founded the first democratic and second independent (after Ethiopia) state in Africa – Liberia – started actively

enslave neighbor tribes.

3) **Democratic**. Printing press appears (though, in fact, it was earlier, I write for convenience, since not all changes happened uniformly), the bible and other religious scribbling is not just in Latin/Greek/Hebrew and available to broad masses and it's clear not only for a few individuals what a hoax it is. Religion gives a way to humanism (humanism is its direct sequel, to be more exact). Industrialization begins. Ancestral aristocracy is being replaced by big bourgeoisie. In the new realities, a completely illiterate rural simpleton is no longer profitable, at least slightly educated workers are in demand. So appear proletarians which realize that they turn out to have some "rights" and being "exploited". Conveyor invented, coincidently or not almost at the say time appear demands for eight hour working day and so on. Against this background, left ideas gain strength, various political theories based on humanism are created – left anarchism, communism, liberalism, fascism. Here it's worth noting that precisely in such realities Marx made his theories... Given all this, it's not really correct to say that proletarians somehow "realized" or were "enlightened" about their "oppressed status", rather this idea was given to them, spread among them, or it also may be said that changing environment created such an idea. Thus, given all aforementioned processes, monarchy in general and absolutism in particular became totally unneeded anyone – neither bourgeoisie who's influence outgrew them and who just sponsored faux kings simulating power, neither popular masses for whom they become a symbol of oppression. As a result, some were overthrown, some just delegated entire power being limited ceremonial functions, and monarchy fell off like a dry scab. Representative democracy in various forms took place. Even though somewhere dictatorship appeared, a dictator in public told in behalf of citizens anyway. In general an individual got still more freedom. Of course, nobody has really let the rabble decide on important or global issues but everyone is supposed to think they do. The central idea is "a human in general", or more exact – "society".

Bit by bit, technical progress has undermined the church authority, invention of telescope particularly contributed to this. The official position of the church was that the Earth being center of the world and Sun revolves around it, based on this all astronomic calculations had been made, many religious celebrations had been tightly connected to stars position on the sky (continuity from pagan astrology). Julian calender was also based on this. But since calculation weren't really accurate, the 10 days disparity had accumulated for centuries (now it's already 13 days) and religious celebrations "went awry". While before a doubting heretic might be sent to bonfire, now inconsistence became way too obvious. Calculations based on the revolution of Earth around the Sun, however, gave accurate result. Ultimately, the church had to adopt the Gregorian calendar but this already was beginning of the end of its power. Although, orthodox christians have kept using the old calender, this is why they celebrate christmas on 7 January and the New Year on 13th. Countries still less pay attention to the Pope's opinion and start forming their own national churches that try to re-brand themselves. One of the first who started publicly reading the bible not in Latin was Luther, the church is trying to resist the schism but everything is useless. As a result, protestantism has formed which incorporated the spirit of emerging capitalism. Civic nationalism also becomes more popular. Feudal states unite in empires, Italy, Germany (the Second Reich) in particular. While earlier king's power relied on ancestral aristocracy, technical progress and industrialization eventually brought to the fore big bourgeoisie and manufacturers, nobility's income was decreasing, estate was mortgaged, kings frequently were credited by big bourgeoisie. Amid these objective social changes king becomes a symbol of oppression, the more proponents of secularization appear. Thus we come to French bourgeois revolution and start of monarchies' fall. Approximately this tine masons gain popularity who, despite having monastic order roots, decided not resist inevitable and supported French revolution. Also it was supported by Jews for whom the church rule entailed constant persecution and robbery. Seeing all this, official church routinely declared all agents of change servants of Satan and spread related propaganda. All this lasted next hundred years while monarchies collapse one by one. In particular, Leo Taxil had been trolling the

church for 10 years and, on the instructions of Vatican, wrote the book about plans of insidious Jew masons-satanists to undermine society and its foundations until showed his hand saying that he just wanted to prove stupidity of church officials. Some conspiracy theorists still take this joke serious and sometimes may even reference to quotes from this book. On this regard also illuminati – another French revolution's spawn – are brought up.
Struggle for independence of the US was as well imbued with the spirit of bourgeois revolution. Many wonder why dollar bill has mason symbols depicted on it, an eye on the pyramid in particular. I think these is nothing mysterious here, founding fathers just borrowed the symbol from Frenchmen. An eye symbolized the eye of god, and according to Jonathan Edwards New England was supposed to become the *"city on a hill[...] shining with reflected Glory of Jehovah which is above it and which will attract and enchant everyone*" ("An Essay on the Trinity")* and implement divine perfectness on the earth. Some symbols can be used in completely different cultures, like, for example, star, cross or swastika. As they say, every repost is a repost of a repost. 19th century was that of mechanistic thinking and society was perceived like a clockwork that can be adjusted if set all screws on its place. In such conditions communism and fascism appeared. In this period, everyone tries to stretch old dogmas religious prejudices on science. Stories about Ham or Jews crucifying Christ don't fit anymore, so are racial theories invented. Various nationalists at this would probably be offended like "how can this be, the white aren't ones who are all backward and the black are more retarded in development than anyone else, so racial theories are accurate and black are really worse and more stupid than white!" and bring up a correlation with intelligence level and crime rate as a proof. But things aren't this straightforward here. A correlation itself says nothing about cause. There is even a special site collecting various funny correlations like between accidents of drowning in the pool and, say, Justin Bieber concerts. The correlations themselves are mathematically reliable but, obviously, those don't have any causal link. Likewise, racists try to pass off the most obvious difference in phenotype as the reason, additionally economic reasons contributed to this in the past. Here, however, I might be asked what after all caused such a big civilizational backlog? In fact, there is no unequivocal scientific answer to this question so far, and specialists might perhaps dedicate many books to this only issue. Nonetheless, I can guess that many various factors, such as, trivially, climate, environment, presents and accessibility of certain fossils etc. contributed to this situation. This is very important at an early stage. While Near East and Europe had, say, copper and tin, this founded the basis of Bronze Age, creation of tools, helped with stone processing, climate and soil characteristics contributed to the start of bricks creation which in turn led to emergence of stone buildings, fortifications and towns ("towns" derives from the word "tun" meaning "enclosed place" or German "Zaun" – "fence"). Africa might just not have such premise. Agriculture also played an important role, in some arid regions of Africa , effective agricultural activity is being problematic even today, not to say about the dawn of the humanity. Initials opportunities of civilizations development effect the final result the most. All in all, events haphazardly led to the outcome we have. *""Of Hazard"—that is the oldest nobility in the world" (F. Nietzsche).* Inhabitants of savannas led a nomadic life and having found more worthwhile territories switched to settlement having formed civilizations. On the other hand, tropic area didn't encourage such a vector of development, and forests inhabitants, like pygmies and such, didn't have major need to leave them going to desert arid regions. Nobody had a goal to develop civilization, people were preoccupied with their vital issues, no more than that. So, crimes rate, intelligence etc. – all this is in large part determined the environment the individual develops. In fact, this underdevelopment is the characteristic of not just the black but also applicable to American Indians, Australian and Polynesian aborigines and many others, including Russia – this "Nigeria with snow" as Brin said (Helmut Schmidt also earlier called USSR Upper Volta with rockets), civil society of which is lower in many aspects than in many African countries. Actually, statehood was brought upon here by Scandinavians, from the West as well. I won't be distracted here, however...
Marxism also initially tries to position itself as a scientific theory. Primitive society is getting romanticized and presented almost as some kind of "lost paradise" of equality and brotherhood where people lived in harmony with nature. Psychoanalysis takes place of theology, and things that

were “sinful” becomes “unnatural”.
God was dead but its corpse was carefully mummified, and was a result two smaller gods – nature and society – have spawned from it. These are materialized in such plebeian ideologies as fascism and communism. Both there ideologies were anti-aristocratic and anti-liberal. By “aristocratic” I don't mean old nobility in particular, rather “aristocracy of the spirit” in general, individualism and egoism.
In the beginning of 20th century, a document called “The protocol of the elders of Zion” has emerged in Russia – that was a fake about treacherous plans of Jews to gain world domination and destroy christian world. The text was allegedly written by Russian Guard Department (in fact an analogue of KGB). The forgery was uncovered quite quickly, however, many still fell for it. In particular an Austrian artist named Adolf was inspired by it... So, there are reasons to blame Russia for everything having further happened. Soviet authorities didn't really hide their support of Hitler, especially when he started war on the West, and devision of Poland fully formalized this partnership. On 17 September of 1939 Soviet government through its official note declared that Poland being a culprit of the war. On 30 November of 1939 Stalin called more “culprits” in the newspaper “Pravda”: *“England and France attacked Germany and thus took responsibility for the current war”*. After WW1, Germany was banned from having offensive weapon as well as prepare to war on its territory. However they did it on the territory of USSR. Stalin gave German commanders classrooms, polygons, shooting ranges. Why does Hitler need to start the two front war unprofitable for him? The official version of Soviet and Russian propaganda may be boiled down to that Hitler just hated Slavs, wanted to enslave them all and treacherously attacked them having mythic “Generalplan Ost ” (which nobody have ever seen) elaborated. But this is not serious, state leaders don't act like this whatever slogans they hide behind. Hitler had no reasons to attack unless he didn't have other choice... For Marx and Engels, the upcoming world war is desirable. War is mother of revolution, the world war is mother of the world revolution. Engels believed that the result of the world war would be *“total exhaustion and creation of condition for ultimate victory of working class*”*. Communists perceived USSR as the foothold for the world communist revolution. In 1916, Lenin straightforwardly spoke that the world revolution would happen as a result of the second imperialist war (“Military program of the proletarian revolution”). Stalin noted in 1927: *“Precisely the fact that the capitalist governments are fascisaized, precisely this very fact leads to the exacerbation of the domestic situation in capitalist countries and to revolutionary actions of workers*” (The speech on the united plenum of Central Committee and Central Communist Committee, 1 August 1927. First published 25 years later, vol.10, p.49)* Trotsky later said: *“There wouldn't have been Hitler and Gestapo without Stalin!”* It was planned that the world war would weaken Europe, and after the Third Reich victory USSR would hit it from behind and spread communism all over the continent. For this purpose, Stalin seized Romania's Bessarabia in 1940.
In his telegram to Tyulenev Stalin writes that Bessarabia must be retained at all costs *“given that we need territory of Bessarabia for organization of attack”*. From there Germany received oil. Wire entanglements were cut off along the border and preparations for offensive war were under way. Precisely the concentration of Soviet troops at the Romanian border was the reason of the Reich's “treacherous attack”. Thanks to this attack, communists eventually got only half of the Europe instead of the whole.
After the war, fascism and national-socialism were appointed as scapegoats, though communism was not less guilty. Soviets cultivated the myth about plan of Slavs genocide, the “Generalplan Ost” that nobody have ever seen, Soviets also originally ascribed victims in Katyn to Germans, while the number of killed Jews were inflated up to 6 millions. No doubt many Jews died due to different reasons – from famine, diseases etc, especially at the end of the war when roads were bombed out and food and other things supply ceased. However, it doesn't look like Germans had planned to exterminate them at least till 1942. As well as during preceding centuries, persecution and robbery had had place, yes, there have been expulsion, using in medical experiences but no more than that. The remains found in Baby Yar is often referred, there, however, as well as in Katyn, many victims

of Soviet authorities have been buried. During all 1930s Jews left the country without any restrictions, only as the war started and world Jewry declared war to Hitler they had been put in concentration camps. By 1930s, 6 millions of Jews lived in the whole Europe, according to existing data about 2 millions moved to USSR (in USSR itself, Jews also were second-class citizens and many were exiled to “reservations”, Jewish Autonomous Oblast in particular), also high number of them moved to the US and other countries. Yes, there are other data on the amount of Jewish population, but, at least, those don't seem to be more plausible, so it's impossible to make ultimate conclusion about their quantity. It looks more plausible that excluding ones died due to objective reasons in war conditions as well as various guerrillas, no more than one million of Jews might be killed because of their ethnicity, without me nitpicking too much. And no, there is not any antisemitism in such an acknowledgment. Even if that was an exaggeration, that was quite beneficial one, especially on that moment. Interpretation of WW2 was a foundation for that world order which in large part exists to this day. Nevertheless, policy on holocaust denying or even trivial skepticism on the real number of victims like in this case, is taking on the characteristics of a religious dogma or medieval policy on god deniers and heretics (it's understandable, the faith after all was the foundation of the order that had existed that time). Even with assuming this theory a conspiracy, no other conspiracy theory, however, is not yet enacted into crime.
This collision of plebeian proponents of the collective good came in handy and paved the way for development of liberalism, as well as got globalization process started. The US gained greatest advantage having the situation deftly exploited, collecting gold reserves and best brains from all over the Europe while not almost being damaged in the war. Post-war Europe shrinks the burden of colonies, on which also the US insisted, and creates united economic space as well as transatlantic war alliance – NATO. Under colonialism, third world countries lived not that bad, but with getting independence degraded to the level that corresponded the stage of development of domestic society, some of them additionally started to try to build socialism... *“Making things worse, fools started to think*”(Saltykov-Shchedrin).* While socialist bloc languished in the stagnation gradually degrading, the capitalist West was advancing on the path of progress, and economic growth contributed to development of individualism and triumph of the personal freedom. Even those social elements which socialists used to declare were way more successfully implemented by the capitalist countries. The logical collapse of socialism ultimately establishes the sole American leadership and also gives space for further globalization. Europe deepen integration and forms European Union, which may even be called the Fourth Reich. This has nothing to do with Nazi ideology, rather this refers to a leading role of Germany in it. Just like the First and the Second Reiches had nothing to do with the Third. The “Reich” is just a state, union... In fact the idea of integration itself is of long standing, even Napoleon dreamed of united Europe.

4) This is what is **now**. Since this period is not yet completely formed, I'm not gonna attribute it with name at this point, in large part the democratic period is still on the way. I'll get back to this later on. For now, I just describe some of its traits. This is a period when automation develops most actively, post-industrial era when service sector grows borders are erased, instant exchange of any information, binding to a certain territory disappears, in general level of welfare grows in the world, so does individualism. The central idea is going to be an individual.

The spiral of history.

All in all, it may be summonsed that the vector of development if as following: [“Interests of nature above all” =>] “Interests of god above all” => “Interests of the state above all” => “Interests of society/community above all” => “Interests of individual above all”. The first, essentially, may be dropped. Since pagan deities personified various natural forces. Decrease of dependence from outer environment, technical development, development of the means of production and increase of the rate of that contributes firstly to a shift from collectivism to individualism, since survival doesn't

tightly linked to the herd membership anymore, secondly, contributes to globalization and blurring of collective identities – be that patrimonial, class, national ones or even identity of sex affiliation. After all, without social, cultural or historical components those would have mean no more than height or hair color do (here do also social stigmas exist, however!) This is an objective process, it doesn't need any conspiracy of the secret world government, Jew masons' plotting, “cultural Marxists” or Dulles' plan. Likewise lactic acid bacteria don't have intention to create kefir, no leader has intention to build new world order. Nonetheless, it will be built, and this trend will further be only strengthening despite of any resistance of reactionary forces. Immoralists' task on this regard is to push that which is ready to fall.

Evolutionarily human being is a primate able to create tools, that is what gives Homo Sapiens advantage over other species. Therefore, evolution of humans is the evolution of tools. Thus, survival of humans goes side by side with technical progress. Any morality is derived from the goal, and the major goal of any sort of life is survival and self-affirmation. So far, morality have been collective since survival used to be primarily based on herd mentality (the word “morality” itself means “a common habit”). Existence determines consciousness. But evolution of the brain cut out for tools creation contributed to emergence of individual consciousness, created basis for individualism and has also triggered process of transformation and subduing of outer world. And existence transformed by consciousness, in turn, determined consciousness again, which repeatedly rejected a part of the old morality. The more I think of it, the more fascinating it looks. Constant development in the struggle. Dialectical, historical spiral, establishment through negation.

Another flaw of morality is inertia – for too long do irrelevant things from the past retain influence. Values should be updated as often as possible, likewise software is. Hence, respectively, as individualism grows, moral pluralism, which in other words is immoralism (it may also be called nihilism or relativism), is also supposed to grow, because the concept of morality itself implies a collective idea. There is the difference between immoralism and amoralism. The latter implies still existing idea of morality while the former is a beyond-moral state – an objective state of material existence where nothing has a moral value.

Trans*modernism: The way towards stateless society through globalization and rule of transnational corporations.

Thus is all the past abandoned: for it might some day happen for the populace to become master, and drown all time in shallow waters. Therefore, O my brethren, a new nobility is needed, which shall be the adversary of all populace and potentate rule, and shall inscribe anew the word "noble" on new tables. O my brethren, not backward shall your nobility gaze, but outward! Exiles shall ye be from all fatherlands and forefather-lands! (F. Nietzsche, Thus spoke Zarathustra)

1. Blessed are the strong, for they shall possess the earth - Cursed are the weak, for they shall inherit the yoke. 2. Blessed are the powerful, for they shall be reverenced among men - Cursed are the feeble, for they shall be blotted out! 3. Blessed are the bold, for they shall be masters of the world - Cursed are the righteously humble, for they shall be trodden under cloven hoofs! 4. Blessed are the victorious, for victory is the basis of right - Cursed are the vanquished, for they shall be vassals forever! (A.S. La Vey, The Satanic Bible)

There, where the state ceaseth—there only commenceth the man who is not superfluous: there commenceth the song of the necessary ones, the single and irreplaceable melody. There, where the state ceaseth—pray look thither, my brethren! Do ye not see it, the rainbow and the bridges of the Superman? (F. Nietzsche, Thus spoke Zarathustra)

Now, regarding the future. Proceeding from the aforementioned tendency, state organization is supposed to go through another cycle of deconstruction towards the increase of personal freedom and individualism. Any system aims to increase its entropy, to the state of anarchy, and human societies are not an exception. I examine here possible approaches and determine the most affective one in respect of achievement of maximal freedom, decentralization (decomposition) of morality,

triumph of progress and individualism. Despite all this being inevitable, objective dialectical development, this, however, consists of particular actions and everything is a part of it, including the text I type at the moment.
For starters, major criteria are to be defined. As have been substantiated in previous chapters, these are inequality, egoism, and, respectively, private property. For the achievement of maximal freedom, no “supreme entities” have to be put above an individual – neither god, nor nature, nor society.

But let's first take a look at a Marxist approach which sees the way to the state abolishment in the abolishment of private property.
How do they really imagine the emergence of private property – like at the beginning of time everyone was equal and everything was shared and then capitalists came up, robbed everyone and took the means of production away. Well, what can I say, foremost, what the means of production in the primitive society? Secondly, yes, within a single commune everything was shared in a sense, meaning that anybody barely had anything, and the needs were basic. Additionally, this doesn't really exclude competition with other communes for resources.
But how does really property emerge? Agriculture, pastoralism appear, at the same time with this do smallholders emerge. Other crafts are being developed. Production diversity grows, natural exchange is not relevant anymore, emerges the need of a universal product with high liquidity which would serve as a simulacrum of real products and which can easily be exchanged for any other product, so do money appear. Craft is passed on through the bloodline, develops, grows, smallholders are getting larger, at some point it become impossible and unprofitable for the owner to make all job on their own, so they delegate certain tasks to other people for payment, so do hired labor and labor division appear, and respectively bourgeoisie and proletarians. Naturally, during this process, people do use force time to time for both protection their property and appropriation of that of others. In this initial “despotic” (see above) period strength sure plays the crucial role, concentrates major part of property around turning into a monopolist, thus a state appears. It is worth extra noting that at the moment of state emergence there were not any proletarians, just the nascent class of smallholders. So, even though someone were robbed, that is smallholders foremost. This was done by less enterprising people who had strength. They might have do this under the banner of communism if such a concept had existed that time. Then, however, the “might is right” principle wasn't off-putting for anyone and perceived as a natural thing, it was still a long way from humanist quirks, so nobody used to go in the trouble of getting into such thinking perversions. So, this is, at very least, extremely one-sided to say that state was created by capitalists to protect property they took away from some vague “proletarians”. State, as well as money, was profitable for everyone. With even having monopoly, state had been formed taking smallholders (which were the majority) interests into account. That was a compromise between strength and property.
Robbing someone didn't play the crucial role in the capital and class of owners forming. Likewise, ancestral nobility later declined and naturally gave way to large capitalists and no because someone robbed them (transformation via revolution was far from being the case everywhere). Kings themselves borrowed off capitalists, landowners themselves mortgaged their estate and so on. Labor theory of value doesn't take into account neither how much this labor in demand by market, nor organizational risks which a capitalists takes on, nor inflation of labor value (even according to Marx, labor is a trade good).
Thus, commies want to restore this “status quo” from the time of primitive society by making property public. That is, the result of the labor of those who took on the rick, dared and got a result or who expanded their business for several generations is supposed to be deprived of them under the mere pretext of it allegedly being the result of hired workers' labor. But if this were so, workers wouldn't need to make anything public, they would just become capitalists and bourgeoisie themselves. “We don't have means of production” – they say. Well, bourgeoisie sort this issue out somehow... “They stole these from proletarians!!!11” So, is the only way to get means of production to steal them? This means, then, communists just want to steal them and take bourgeoisie's place,

i.e. to go along the same way from primitive society over again. “We just take back that which was stolen from proletarians!” But owners of property appear before hired labor, as have been said above... And here we go around over again.
Some maneuver saying that only the ownership of means of production should be made publicly shared. But actually what's the difference? One can't draw distinction on this matter, any property can be a mean of production of goods or services – even a personal computer. This entirely depends on how an individual manages it. Allowing property for personal use and prohibiting it as a mean of production in fact means encroachment on one of the primary criteria of property – the ability to manage it at will.
Moreover, how can something be publicly shared isn't really clear. What usually implied by this is “shared within a commune”. It turns out, then, that a commune is in fact being the owner. And hierarchy will inevitably be formed therein... And it's usually implied that communes would exchange their products, plus without money. As if this wouldn't lower liquidity of goods in case of a commune likewise it does in case of any other capitalist. Money is the “blood of economy” but communists want to mummify it just like they did to their Lenin. And what would stop communes from competition among themselves? Faith in ideals of communism? Actually, tries to build communes already had place, at least on household level, Klaus Mehnert describes this as following: *“Commune members commit to allocate their whole wage to commune budget. A complete commune is considered as “a highest form of people living together”. However, on creation of such complete communes it turned out that lack of attention to the issues of collective and personality structure led to emergence of authoritarian forms of relationship characterized by certain amount of compulsion. […] In the Moscow state library a complete commune has formed where all the members were given identical coats, shoes and even underwear. If some of the members wanted to wear their own coat or underwear, this was condemned as display of “bourgeoisness”. There was not private life at all. It was forbidden to, for example, keep up closer friendship with particular members of the commune. Love was perceived as something reprehensible. If a girl was seen to like to talk to a particular commune member more, they both were smeared at the meeting as “destroyers of communist ethics”*.”(Klaus Mehnert. Die Jugend in Sowjetrupland).* There is also noted that it was initially planned to do all homework on their own. Very soon, however, commune members turned to be too overloaded with errands to do out home. As a result, it was decided to hire a housekeeper. But isn't this a pure exploitation? After the thorough consulting it was decided: *“Any person has always to use paid service of others; he gives in clothes to laundry, calls for a janitor to mop the floor, orders a shirt from a tailor. Hiring a housekeeper is essentially the same with the only difference that all aforementioned tasks are made in this case by one person*”*. Further comment is unnecessary. As have been mentioned, precisely inequality is being the basis of any movement and development. In the conditions of equality, there is no goods circulation, there is no economy, as well as development doesn't exist. If smallholders hadn't “exploited” their hired workers, hadn't appropriated surplus value, they wouldn't have become large capitalists, production rate wouldn't have increased, so wouldn't economy have, there would have been no progress – neither technical nor social. Likewise, if slavery hadn't existed the foundation for overcoming slavery wouldn't have been created. Communism implies all people will be such righteous Jesus-lings farting with rainbow and solely thinking about common good. Such a “magic of friendship” of my little commie... But that's not even the point. Even if people become being this way, this would mean stagnation and death, this would mean to crucify mankind for sake of redemption of the “sin of egoism”, the “sin of exploitation” and “privileges”.
Leftists might say that capitalists should give not all profit but just that they spend on “excesses” like yachts, private jets, golden toilets, sluts and drugs. But who's up to decide what's “excesses”? Abstract “society”, rabble? But a capitalist is interested to get profit as long as they spend it on whatever they want, they're in business not for sake of serving society, pushing civilization forward or some higher ideals, but for sake of yachts and private jets. Serving “everyone”, “society” is way worse than serving a single capitalist. Where direct vested interest is destroyed, development stops, and forced labor has a go. Given all this, I consider this approach a delusion which inevitably leads

to “state capitalism” (as leftists call it). Marxism is economic theology.

Now, let's consider classic libertarian approach with private property and NAP. The main problem here is also that most of theorists have it based on the premise that all or majority of people are “good” or rather conscious and rational. Thinking so means seriously overrating them. Hence, it is derived of this premise that private security services will not be attacking one another because it's unprofitable for them and risk is unjustified. This is the case for the majority, however, there might be some passionaries who would risk it all, collude with such others and take everything over. After all, why does someone have to follow an abstract NAP?
The voluntary ex-territorial contract jurisdictions come in handy. These regulate legal relations between the members. This enables an individual to choose a jurisdiction for any taste, and members of the jurisdiction don't need to occupy the same territory. It will be possible to change the jurisdiction as easy as to change ISP, without a lot of hassle. Likewise my neighbor can use ISP different than mine while person in other city being connected to my ISP, twp persons on the same street can use service of different contract jurisdictions, as well as they can change their location moving in other part of the world. It would be also possible to lease estate from the jurisdiction, if there is a need, likewise now a router is often leased from ISP.
But, after all, all this won't appear out of nothing, the basis for those in the modern realities should be found. And the best candidate I see is the **transnational corporations** which are for whatever reason deionized by conspiracy theories fans (notably, according to their theories it turns out that global financial elites want to establish Marxism, which is as nonsensical as if racists wanted to give up power to the black, it's funny how conservatives disguise their implicit leftism with anti-leftist slogans). Those have enough resources, their resource isn't based on such purely “state”, traditional methods of control as religion, spirituality, patriotism, motherland, nation and other. Those are driven by a natural desire to maximize benefit and those don't have much reasons to cultivate all aforementioned. But there is a thing they are interested in – in consumption of goods and services. Consumption is that contributes to the world economy growth and further development. Consumption, hence, becomes such a integrating idea for broad masses, a sort of replacement for patriotism, nationalism, “love to motherland”. Proletarians, workers – all this is out of date. A new “class” will be built – consumers. Perhaps, at some point people will even be paid for consumption. Just like commies wanted – “each according to his need”. Though, not because of communism but in spite of it. Honestly, dichotomy between ancom and ancap is somewhat artificial, derived of the misconception that one can get rid of property and capital, while in reality it is an indispensable feature of the real world (as well as power, the source of which is each and every person, not state or capital specifically) and property can only be reallocated. As have been shown earlier, communes also inevitable obtain corporative traits. Given the aforementioned, I **consider consumer society a good , swell and beneficial thing**. I have been said, by “equality”, usually “equality in consumption” is being understood., and this sort of equality is possible only in the case of having inexhaustible resources. For example, air is inexhaustible, so everyone consumes it equally, which, however, doesn't mean that each consumes equal amount of oxygen – after all, everyone has different lungs... So, such an equality will quite likely be reached, because of the further economic growth and increase of production rate. Technologies will likely become a part of environment and malls will be visited as forest during mushroom hunting.

One more requirement for the transfer from national states to TNC/contract jurisdictions is globalization, destruction of national identities and forming united cosmopolitan progressively thinking convergence. Among the right as well as the left anarchists, the majority agree on that the anarchy is impossible in a single state and should come globally all over the world. Therefore, as long as irresistible contradictions in national mentality exist, national states will exploit them keeping their power. All this would hinder to implement the new world order. It's important that progressive forces be the ones who set the tone, because in a backward society filled with traditionalist prejudices and herd mentality, ancap would inevitable degrade to feudalism. Therefore

it is necessary to combat all this, starting with taking control over the backward and reactionary states by progressive forces.
Political integration usually follows economical one, and where economical barriers are erased – i.e. transfer from national economy to the global has place – the national barriers are also erased – erosion of national identity happens. Given this, the conservative position of supporting free trade but willing to save nation is quite absurd. Completely free market within national states is impossible because, given different level of development of different countries, there is no other choice but to enact customs duty to protect national economics, but in the homogeneous globalized world, there will not be such a problem. Toleration, multiculturalism, cosmopolitanism are also beneficial for globalization because they eliminate old group conflicts. During the overcome of these old forms of collective consciousness anti-freedom tendencies like "affirmative action" are possible, but this is solely due to dialectical nature of development, it is necessary to overcome the old, anachronistic – at least each such a "cycle" in development is less authoritarian than preceding ones. Such measures accelerate development and push inert thinking of philistine masses forward. As Chernyshevsky said: *"To straighten a stick once bent in one direction, necessary to bend it in the opposite direction*"*. After all, multiculturalism is still not individualistic enough and also should be overcome, atomized into single individuals. There will be no discriminating and discriminated groups just because there will be no groups themselves, as well as herd mentality. At the same time, it can be considered as a global planetary convergence based on individualist western values and western mentality. Well, meaning that which is now called western, though in essence they are so not because of their westerness but due to development, the West is just the most progressive part of humanity. Western values, mentality = the values and mentality of the developed civilizations.

I add a few words on corporations. Sometimes it can be heard from conservatives and some "libertarian" leftists that corporations allegedly impede free market and competition, and as a demonstration they will refer to various companies that received state aid during crises. But government intervention in economy (regardless of either it helping or hindering a private owner) is exactly leftism. But in anarcho-capitalism, due to absence of the state, there cannot be such an aid, so competition will eventually be free, too. For the same reason thesis of ancap opponents of impossibility of free market due to its monopolization without state control is inaccurate. Now governments resist monopolization rather to save their own monopoly and political power than due to care of competition and prices. Anyway, no matter how hard the state tries to slow down this process, influence of corporations will eventually outgrow that of political officials, and national states will be dissolved. Absence of taxes and state aid, as well as cyclical crises, will over some time exacerbate competition and make the market freer. The concern of that monopolists will negotiate and jack up the prices is not plausible because this would attract other players with lower prices onto the market, plus monopolists themselves aside of a collective interest to part in conspiracy have also personal interest to lower prices to get competitive advantage on the market. Without collectivist spirit monopolization will never be complete and/or permanent.
In fact, despite all their declared "anti-corporatism" the left is very corporative. Collectivism is just an extended corporatism where the circle of "allies" spans higher number of members, ideally all the people. An the higher number of the members the less freedom left for an individual. National interests or interests of proletarians are, as well, the corporative interests that span way larger spheres of life than a single organization. Socialism and communism, with being corporative by definition, impose their "corporative ethics", which in a global extent means morality, "universal human values" etc. Therefore leftism is unacceptable for a fundamental opponent of morality, a consistent individualist and egoist who doesn't wish to act for sake of common good. The collective / corporative is overcome through the triumph of individualism and total atomization of society. The idea that the atomization of society leads to authoritarianism isn't correct because it examines an incomplete and inhomogeneous atomization that doesn't include the authorities themselves. And despite of a seeming "left" historical trend, if we take collectivism as the primary criteria of leftism,

during the entire history actually the movement rightwards has had place, form the primitive society to individualism, free market, capitalism. With understanding capitalism as a free market, the real capitalism is yet about to be built! The capitalism where private worker is free from herd opinion of narrow-minded working class. And if company's business interests are linked to the support of leftist agenda it isn't anyhow better than if they have to fit in the requirements of traditional values, patriotism, religion and such.
In essence, egalitarian anti-imperialism and conservative isolationism are also forms of the corporative – they both recognize national/corporative interests of the countries, as well as their "ethics"/culture, just conservatives focus on national interests (like "it's not our business what happens in other countries") while leftists on "exploitation" of other countries that are perceived by them weak or oppressed.

Earlier I promised to get back to issue of the name of upcoming period. So, I call it trans*cratic. Also, many think how to name era following post-modernism, I think trans*modernism fits well. Just because it's going to contain some trans-humanism. Additionaly, trans-humanists use the term "transhuman". In essence, "trans" means "going beyond". Therefore, immoralism can also be called transmoralism or postmoralism.

PS: After I wrote this chapter, I suddenly decided to google the word I made up and, all of sudden, this word had already been used by a Mexican philosopher, so I explicitly note here that the sense he puts in it **has nothing to do** with the sense put therein by me. He's rather got some sort of reactionary neomodern, not to mention that to consider such global concepts as movement or ideology is very odd – as if Middle Ages, Modern Time or Postmodern were ideologies and not objective reality of time determined by the development of the relations of production level... But I don't really want to give up the term I invented because of a philosophical wetback, therefore, so that to distance myself from him, I'm gonna write my term as trans*modernism. In this form I put it in the title.

On the future of religion.

"this is my doubt of you, and my secret laughter: I suspect ye would call my Superman—a devil!"
(F. Nietzsche, Thus Spoke Zarathustra)

As it has been noted earlier, now the process of forming new morality based apparently on toleration is on the way. It's going to be the great reset in line with that happened during the transfer from paganism to monotheism, from the Dionysian to Apollonian. Now it's again gonna be transfer to Dionysian but, of course, in the new quality, on the basis of the preceding, and not in the sense of a return to the old. Of course, it's desirable to uproot religious thinking but it's gonna happen progressively anyway. Before this happen, satanism has good chances to take the niche. It, however, can be distorted (like it, in fact, happened with christianity), and I frequently see "satanists" who's at the same time being proponents of communism (purely christian ideology, though they were apparently influenced by conservative propaganda that tries to link these two things together), and the image of Satan itself oftentimes takes humanist form in the mass culture. Such a pseudo-satanism is quite absurd given that the major (not the deepest though) satanism ideologists, Crowley and la Vey, gravitated rather to social-Darwinism and Nietzscheanism (la Vey's one is also a bit in line with Ayn Rand's objectivism). In fact, "Satan" is virtually Nietzsche's "meaning of the earth". Let's take a look at the most significant Satan's activity in the bible (without taking into account here that nothing in the original text indicates that the serpent is precisely Satan). *"You will not certainly die," the serpent said to the woman. "For God knows that when you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil."(Gen. 3:4-5)*
"Then the eyes of both of them were opened, and they realized they were naked; so they sewed fig leaves together and made coverings for themselves."(Gen. 3:7)

This may be interpreted that humans had been akin to animals and then acquired self-consciousness. Serpent did good job in this case. Although this made humans have a sense of guilt for their bestial origin (which is seen all the way through christianity), and it was expressed in moral prejudices, but these are consciousness overheads. Putting aside literal interpretation and trying to look at this more symbolic (with “deep sense research syndrome”, yup) one might conclude something like following: Humans, having the consciousness acquired and understood themselves («eaten from the tree of knowledge») ashamed their nudity (their animal origin), realized their mortality (“became moral” in some subjective sense) and, respectively, “paradise” of ignorance dispelled for them, their knowledge increased their sorrow. They were “expelled”. Not because of “knowing good and evil” but creating them. In this sense god's tyranny over man means mind's tyranny over body, or idea over instincts. God is pure consciousness that is free from this world, the absolute idea. And humans were “expelled from paradise”, according to the biblical text, because of fear they might have eaten from the tree of immortality as well: «And the Lord God said, “The man has now become like one of us, knowing good and evil. He must not be allowed to reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life and eat, and live forever”.» Wait, so man was originally moral and didn't have that eternal life in paradise which is often spoken about? Well, after all religion is a bunch of inconsistent nonsense. Anyway, christianity have always had a complex for the animal origins. Most vividly this complex had shown itself in early christianity with all its saints who despised body, didn't wash all the life, fasted, chopped of genitalia, did self-flagellation, lived on the pillar and other. There begs a joke about the Middle Age actionism.
Actually, according to gnostics, the universe was created not by god but by the prototype of Satan – Demiurge (creator) who was one of aeons (concept based on Platonian system of emanations). It was jealous of "god", wanted to become the center of Pleroma and was expelled, thereafter created the universe from the spirit of conflict. As Valentinus explains, Demiurge *"created heaven without knowledge, man without knowledge of a man, and created earth without understanding of it*"*. That is, apart of the biblical story predicting the fall of Nebuchadnezzar (as have been already noted) compared with "morning star", the prototype of the story about Lucifer who rebelled against god and was put down in hell was also the gnostics doctrine who in part anticipated dialectical materialism and suggested the idea of emergence of the world without intelligent design. Anyway, it will take additional efforts to clear up this idea of leftism. Also, subjectivism becomes a side effect of relativism thereby contributing to the spread of one more form of religion – conspiracy theories which risks becoming the prevailing. On the early stage of christianity spreading also large diversity of sects, ideas and doctrines had place. Today, there similarly appear the more various idiosyncrasies, from the ten of areas of feminism to “libertarian socialists”, alter-globalists and neo-modern fans. Likewise the majority of christian sects over time disappeared, same will apparently happen now. Purpose of immoralism on this regard is to contribute to filtering out various potentially collectivist and reactionary ideas, so that leftists and conservatives don't get the world into new middle ages as christians did. Though, to be exact, “early middle ages” in a sense came already. After all, “middle ages” is not necessary decline and stagnation (it was given this image in the modern time), it is also active ideological transformation on fundamental level, it is ecumene united by supranational structures and common values, and transfer to the rule of TNC will create an additional resemblance to feudalism. The negative, reactionary hue can be given to this “new middle ages” only by collectivism and “humanity”, but it's not necessary to follow this way. Our way is the way of maximum “dehumanization” and objectivism.

Queer-capitalism.
Money in the globalized world.

On the one hand, Marx quite accurately noted that social formations change over development of the means of production. Further, however, a quite strange conclusion was made from this that proletarians are going to be the ruling class having “dictatorship of proletariat” established (it's

unclear over whom if there will be no capitalists). Proletarians are a priori the hired workers, and if they own the means of production, they are owners – capitalists. Even if it is a collective ownership within a single commune, it doesn't make big difference from a joint-stock company or corporation. In essence, it is anarcho-capitalism! Marx, in fact, should have come in his reasoning to something like ancap. The leftists idol is the last person I wish to be associated with, but some his ideas are very similar to mine (which I made long before I reviewed his texts). First, it doesn't look like Marx considered capitalism something that should be fought or destroyed: *"monopoly of the private capital or state should not be mistaken for socialization. Socialization is a long-tern economic process of establishing real economic relations. Nationalizations are in the first place legal and institutional actions of the state which itself belongs to a certain class. Nationalization can also be carried put by the state that belong to the worker class."[...] "such an abolishment of private property is not at all being a true utilization of it, that is precisely seen from the abstract negation of the whole world of culture and civilization, from the return to the unnatural innocence of the poor, rough, not having needs person who not just didn't overcome the level of private property but didn't even reach it yet. For such sort of communism, commonality is merely that of labor and equality of wage paid by the commune capital, a commune as a universal capitalist.*"* Rather opposite, capitalism is presented as what it really is – a drive of progress (although, development towards mythic communism is implied). Secondly, just like I do, he presents globalism and market as something that destroys national identity (yet, leftists and conservatives are usually anti-globalists): *"The need in constantly increasing production sale drives bourgeoisie all over the globe. It has to infiltrate, settle down, establish links everywhere. Bourgeoisie, through the exploitation of global market, made production and consumption of all countries cosmopolitan. To the great woe of reactionaries, it pulled the national ground out of industry. Primordial national branches of industry have been destroyed and keep being destroyed every day*"*. Here's more: *"Hence, the state is not going to exist forever. […] Society that will organize manufacturing in a new way based on free and equal association of manufacturers, will send the whole state machine to where it belongs: to museum of antiquities, beside a spinning wheel and bronze ax*"*. In my opinion, "a free association of manufacturers" is similar to my idea of transfer from national states to the rule of transnational corporations. It also looks like Marx doesn't have a goal to build communism, unlike his followers: *"Communism for us is not the state that should be established, not an ideal the reality should adjust to. What we call communism is the actual movement which destroys the current state*"*. I've got a feeling that Marx just labeled his theory with a popular word (or felt that all this communism smells like the old theological idealism and therefore made such a disclaimer). Firstly, there was not an idea of ancap yet while idea of socialism/communism already was (in a more idealistic form). Secondly, given his generally accurate dialectical understanding of historical process and elimination of old conflicts through Aufhebung, engagement of idealistic concept of socialism/communism in this looks completely redundant (even though Marx diligently opposed his doctrine to the "utopian socialism", it has the same idealistic goal). Marx treats society as an abstraction of the thought. Dialectical materialism has the statement that "matter is an abstraction of the thought", i.e. not the matter of a kind but concept of "a matter in general", likewise here it is essentially the same (Plato, for instance, had "beauty in general" and other, which the specific, less perfect emanations were spawned from). Society, like a sort of deity, an idea, is alienated from the person, put above them. Public ownership of the means of production is not, therefore, someone's ownership, not that of a specific "proletarian" or the group of "proletarians" (though they're no longer proletarians since not being hired workers anymore) but this is either nobody's, ownerless ownership or the ownership of the one who's being the high priest, representative of society the god, while real people receive merely some emanations. Who does a public toilet belong to? Certainly not the public. When it's said about exploitation and a worker not to get the entire value of the item they produced, it also should be taken into account that Marx implies not the labor of a specific worker but abstract labor – "average grade of fever in the hospital", average time of production of this item. This "normal distribution" benefits the least qualified workers more than anyone else, id est their labor is evaluated in average higher than it were in the case of more individual labor

evaluation. Hence, labor theory of value based solely on generalization and doesn't allow to evaluate a specific labor. It is as archaic as racial theory or something else from 19th century. By the way, it was invented not by Marx but Adam Smith, Marx just accepted it as starting point of his reasoning. Given this, a society being an abstraction of the thought, “public ownership of the means of production” for Marx is rather not a prohibition to own this property privately but the state where the level of economical development and relations of production allows everyone to privately own the means of production, id est to be a capitalist. In other words, this is precisely ancap. As I often repeat, there is no society, just individuals. The words like “communism” or “socialism” are rather confusing. First, etymologically and historically these imply an idea opposite to individualism. Secondly, both commies and socialists imply by this word a completely different thing, the pwning blasted bourgeoisie and the ideal which should be established for sake of “justice”, namely utopian socialism (even those few understanding dialectics will be maneuvering and disguising it with sophisms when being pointed out that things go towards ancap instead of communism). Thirdly, universal equality and brotherhood which communism implies would be supposed to out an end to any dialectical movement and further development. This would be a sort of Fukuyama's “the end of history”.
The left would perhaps argue regarding “free associations” that it's gonna be cooperatives of sorts with equal distribution of income/stock and all members' equal participation in the management which is absurd per se, since a toilet cleaner, even if they wanted to, cannot equally participate in the enterprise management. Each work requires different qualification level and, respectively, being evaluated differently. Due to inequality of the members of this community, its structure will inevitably be hierarchical. What cooperatives proponents essentially suggest is a guaranteed share of certain privileged social groups in the income of monopolistic industries. Even though cooperative may initially be a voluntary association with equal distribution of income - this would attract new members and eventually contribute to monopolization. Now they normally work and look attractive solely because, firstly, they aren't much different from corporations, secondly it's not the only the form of property available, so market competition is possible, thirdly, they exist in particular spheres only. A commune is gonna have corporative interests as well. While the lack of money would still strengthen esprit de corps and mutual responsibility putting me in the dependency of the commune, depriving me of my self-ownership, additionally this would lead to a stop of the development in all areas, because speed of development is directly proportional to the speed of the movement of goods. One of the fundamental requirements of economic development is that volume of money supply should be proportional to the volume of commodity supply. If the amount of money market has is less than that of commodities, it's getting hard to exchange your production for money and, respectively, the incentive to produce more commodities disappears. If there is more money than the surplus is just eaten up by inflation. Thereby, increase of consumption develops economy. Additionally, people have a deferred demand which can be satisfied through accumulation only. Therefore abolishment of money leads to degradation and enables to fully dive into the primitive era of natural exchange. However, such experiments never lasted long time and communists didn't stick around their newfound “lost paradise”. Anarcho-primitivists are more consistent on this regard. As long as there was no money, things didn't have value, merely idea of a need existed which boiled down primarily to the basic needs, like in the case of animals. Savages counting was based on the concept of sufficiency for one person. Precisely for this reason, some Indians might sell their land for glass beads, as well as might demand the whole ship's cargo for a bunch of their items.

In essence, what's money... It is pure thermodynamics. A quantitative expression of the energy wasted (effectively) by person. Transformation of matter, its modification into more ordered state requires waste of energy. Destruction of an object also requires waste of energy but always less than that wasted for its creation. Even if it is spontaneous emergence of some mountains or life over time, or vise versa, destruction, anyway the energy is cumulatively wasted; chaos leads to ordering and ordering leads to chaos, as have been noted in the beginning. But, of course, in this case it takes

much more time than in case of “blowing in” the energy directly. After all, time is just a measure of movement, change of matter. Therefore wine becomes more expensive by just getting older (of course, particular cases of price and time relations is much more complex, for example, a car loses a significant part of it prices as soon as it leaves car dealership, because if someone sells a recently bought car it there are likely some problems with it, plus there is no need to by a new car second-hand for the same price when it's possible to buy it in car dealership, however, here I rather talk about the situation in a larger and long-term scale, so 100 years later this car could be still more expensive than initially, as an antique one). Id est, this is a sort of a sine wave. And sine wave is a function of cyclic movement in space, projection of spiral on a plane.
Death is essentially a thermodynamic equilibrium. Equality. Any isolated system seeks to thermodynamic equilibrium. That's natural. Maximum homogeneity is achieved with maximum system entropy. Human society on this regard isn't an exception. Some time a commune was an isolated system, then it was states, empires. Eventually, the whole planet can be considered an isolated system. And yes, in this sense equality will be reached as soon as the system accumulate enough energy, in other words increase production rate as much that it would exceed any capabilities of the world consumption.

Money is also a commodity. In the primitive society, there was no need in money per se due to comparatively small number of members of the community. Items, equally primitive, can be just exchanged. The easier to exchange one commodities for others the higher the speed of the exchange of goods, the more actively economy develops. Natural exchange has the lowest speed of development. However, as the tools were getting more complicated and human communities grew, it became ineffective because of both increase of variety of items, and their having different complexity, and sole exchange of items would have created confusion and inconvenience. Therefore people started using objects quite widespread in their region. These might be seashells, certain stones, some sheep in pastoralist societies or, for example, salt (from this comes the omen of “spilling salt is a sign of future quarrel”, this was like to lose money). The same system still has place in jails where cigarettes or tea can play the role of money. There was generally tendency towards miniaturization of those objects, for more convenient transportation and exchange. To be exact, development is caused not even by commodities movement per se but by manufacturing. The incentive to produce more goods than needed for personal consumption appears only in case these can be exchanged for a universal commodity that doesn't spoil and which can always be exchanged for necessary products. The more goods are produced the more actively economy grows and the more money it is supposed to have. But production rate increased more and more, no sheep were enough, plus it was unprofitable to breed them in such an amount, not to mention that driving the herd thousands of kilometers away is not the best idea. Seashells seem to be ok but these are not in all regions, certain uniformity was needed. Thus humanity came to precious metals, foremost to gold, secondly, to sliver and copper – the metals quite homogeneously spread all over the world, easily forged and yet rare enough to have value. For long time, the primary place of concentration of gold were churches – starting with multiple donation and to crusade minings. Despite that the church used to prohibit usury for its parish, it could practice it by itself in a veiled form, often lent to kings, duke and their military and other enterprises. The most famous example is the Templars order. But trade develops, so do the banks that make a deal with the church, and in exchange for regular money transfer and last will in favor of it Vatican holds the mass for forgiveness of their sin of usury. Still now, in the temples of Venice the named grave tables paved in the floor can be seen. Thus, the Hundred Years' War was already funded by Italian banking houses Bardi and Peruzzi. Later they were replaced by Fugger and Welser families, and then Rothschild family.
World economy kept growing, gold mining became to unable to cope with its needs, so states more often resorted to the coinage debasement by adding copper and other cheaper admixtures to gold and sliver coins with keeping the same par value. Gresham's law – "bad money drives out good" – has worked, everyone tried to pay with debased money and gold was gradually driven out of circulation. Additionally, banks could take items, including golden ones, as collateral giving out

notes backed by gold in return. The bearer could always exchanged these for an amount of gold they represented. It was often more convenient than carrying bags with gold back and forth. Thus bills (banknotes) are formalized. However, needs of economy still grow more and more, so do the amount of those who want to get a loan from banks – starting with private persons and ending with states – as a result this leads the emission of fractional reserve money. Simply put, the notes backed by gold that didn't exist became to be given out. And the more economy grew the more this disproportion did. At the beginning it was kept quiet, and in the case of too many depositors wanting to get gold banks went bust, over time bills got designation on what percentage these backed by gold and this percentage was gradually decreasing. That which was later called the Triffin paradox formed. This however was quite profitable for economy and enabled to increase production rate which, in turn, pushed general progress forward – both technical and social. Previously almost immutable world starts to change the more and more rapidly, and traditional social institutions, traditions and forms of power are getting out of date. The more economy develops the more it is mortgaged, the more it is bank interest based and the higher importance of banks and business in general in it. Ancestry nobility and monarchy are no longer relevant in such conditions, the more dependent on business and being rather obstacle. English bourgeois revolution can be considered the start of its decay, which led, among other things, to creation of the Bank of England – the first private central bank. Changing environment also affects religion and leads to forming of protestantism that encourages capitalism. Later the USA get independence, then French revolution and transfer to democracy. I a little repeat myself but here it is mentioned in economic context specifically. State was gradually losing monopoly on money emission.

Remarkably, a decentralized finance system was formed in the USA, and any private bank could issue its own money. It, however, was unstable and was accompanied with frequent busts and financial crises. In an emergency state had to turn printing machine on. All this resulted in creation of the “Bank of North America” in 1781 – a private bank which 's money had priority. Two years later, however, under pressing of states authorities and other banks it was deprived of federal license. In 1816, after the war with England and financial chaos, the Second Bank of the US appears with federal license for 20 years which had been supposed to fulfill the commitments for exchange banknotes for money and, of course, it couldn't have done this. Banks are allowed for emission of fractional reserve money, follow crises of 1873, 1884, 1893 and 1907. In 1913 the third central bank – the Federal Reserve System has been created. WW1 enables the US to concentrate substantial amount of gold from Europe on its territory, this leads rapid economic growth. Nonetheless, growth of economy significantly exceeds that of gold reserves, so as a result it ends up with the Great Depression. In 1933 Franklin Roosevelt issues the law whereby everyone should give in their gold for 20 dollars a ounce. Possession of gold was punished with a large fine or 10 years of jail. WW2 enables to increase gold reserves even more, some give the gold in for safekeeping, others like USSR pay for industrialization and other. In 1944 the US suggests to use dollar 100% backed by gold as a currency for international payment. The Bretton Woods agreement is concluded. But capitalist world economy keeps growing (while planned economy of socialist block gradually decays) and in 1971 the US ceases to give out the gold for their obligations and suggest to keep using dollar for payment as if it were the simulacrum of gold. This was just ingenious exploitation of the situation. Other countries didn't have other choice – declared amount of gold just didn't exist, a return to it would only shrink economies and slow down development, waging war with the US is also not an option – it got stronger plus resisting to Soviets was more important. At the same time it is possible to print as many dollars as needed, no more crises due to Triffin paradox, stable and fast economical development. Jamaica accords were concluded having made the US, the FRS to be exact, a virtually sole source of universal world currency, a monopolist of “new gold”. After the victory in the Cold War, this status took root completely, having still more favorable basis for globalization, while money took another step towards turning into an abstraction.

The way things turned out is just great! Such a financial monopoly in theory enables to suffocate

even without war any reactionary authoritarian regime by cutting off financial flows, and vise versa, to provide credit facilities for countries that follow the way of progress and liberalism, in fact, the way of globalization. The US is thus being a primary driving force of the world progress – this is its major civilizational mission as the only and last superpower.
The “red-brown” (conservatives, tankies and such) say like “dollar is paper backed by nothing” – but this is actually great, be that backed by something, this would eventually cause disproportion between the needs of growing economy and volume of the resource it is backed by. Gold standard proponents would perhaps argue that the disproportion cab be dealt by means of deflation – by compensating the lack of gold with proportional increase of its value. But deflation would encourage to take money out of circulation and bury them. Why do I have to buy something today if I will buy more for the same amount of money tomorrow? Thus, economy in such conditions starts dying. On the other hand, inflation, vise versa, stimulates to waste money, these transport energy wasted on goods and services production like hemoglobin transports oxygen, as a result economy lives and develops.

Likewise, in the day, power went from the church that was toppled by progress, to national states, in the future national states are gonna step down giving a way to transnational corporations in the new globalized world. These corporations will apparently be the basis which ex-territorial contract jurisdictions are going to be formed on. Since world economy will keep growing, money are supposed to become still more abstract. Already now non-cash payment becomes more widespread over time. When it just appeared, many went to cash machines right away to get salary in cash, now it's not the case. Though many still firmly associate money with bills, as before, a 100 years ago it was likewise associated with gold. I think eventually will not be printed at all, because there's no need, just smearing the paper... And money will become just abstract digits, a set of zeros and ones. It is possible to cease printing already now but so that nobody go into a panic, this is implemented gradually. Additionally, there are still poorly-developed regions where paper money are necessary. In the globalized world, centralized emission will no longer be relevant since there will be neither states in traditional sense nor national economies, so cryptocurrency can become money. Cryptocurrency oftentimes become a source of certain myths and unreasonable expectations. For example, an opinion can be heard that everyone will be able to issue their own money. This is actually dubious. They could rather try, but in most cases those will be none of a value and ones who have resources, production capacity, mining farms and such will have the advantage. Most likely it's gonna be corporations. It would be possible to even build mining farms on the moon, with developing satellite Internet this is manageable task. At this point even traditional forging the money becomes irrelevant, since a banknote of any par value can be drawn while it's useless for a single person to mine any serious amount of money. Also, though not very often yet, but do some tankies pop up who relay on cryptocurrency as a mean against dollar hegemony. Some even want Russia, China and others to switch to cryprocurrency transactions instead of utterly lame ideas of gold or national currency transactions. First, likewise ruble and other currencies are bought for dollar, cryptocurrency will also be eventually bought for either dollar/national currency bought for dollar or mined. Even if it is mined, other market participants would have to buy it for the same dollar to have transactions with it. This doesn't make big difference from traditional printing money. Additionally, goods competitiveness would drop. This doesn't well fit national economies. Secondly, dollar collapse would mean the collapse of the world economy, and any state decided to switch to cryprocurrence would accelerate only its own disintegration. To have less expenses, demolition should be controlled, and the world is not ready yet, not globalized enough. So, it doesn't absolutely fit expansionist eurasianist imperial dreams of the red-brown. Rather opposite, to survive, such regimes will have to become more restricted both economically and politically, more isolated from the outer globalizing world – until changes smash them.

Economic growth goes in cycles – a rise is altered with crisis, then rise again and so on. But recession is usually still lower than growth, so this is an ascending spiral. In general, of course, it is

supposed to increase consumption equality in the way described earlier – by increasing abundance, so that everyone will be able to consume virtually as much as they want. But absolute equality would be possible only in an infinite system. In this case this notional spiral would stop going upwards and its coils dispersed and disappeared like the ripples on a pond. Since material existence, after all, does have limits, any approaching equality is supposed to lead to a new inequality, the inequality of newer magnitude. Absolute equality is, thus, unattainable like horizon.

After the collapse of socialism in the last century, its theorists have seriously reviews their approach to Marxism and left idea in general. Thus, “libertarian” socialists have emerged. The changes introduced had both positive and negative sides. On the one hand, they recognized market economy, self-ownership and private property in a degree, but on the other hand, they rejected historical materialism and rational objective approach, and intentionally resort to what classical Marxism used to call an “utopian socialism”, “socialist dreams”. Dialectical materialism didn't imply existence of absolute values, and classical Marxism didn't claim it was better than capitalism due to a normative principle (“moral superiority”). It used to position itself as a scientific theory (even though it was built upon the basis of an idealist narrative). However, the most of leftists professed, and still do, an “utopian socialism” precisely and used to support Marxism foremost because of this basis, not its “scientific” nature, with having learned a few simplified ideas from Marx and completely ignoring the author's disclaimers. “Libertarian” socialists, thus, just formalize this idealistic conception by suggesting the market that restricted by norms of equality, ethics and a moral imperative. As Jerald Cohen said, even if members of a society have equal income but “nobody does anything for others without vested motives, this is not a socialist society*”, thereby expressing the core of the left idea (and, as well, confirming that I have nothing to do with leftists). Likewise many others, “libertarians” socialists misunderstand the concept of freedom by giving priority to the idealist freedom (from the material and objective material limitations). In line with classical Marxism I might call it also an “utopian freedom”. Such a system perhaps can give a person comfort but in exchange requires them to be a “righteous man”. It's a literal religious heaven implementation. For example, Cohen equates a capitalist's lack of freedom to dispose of their income due to their accountability to “society” and a proletarian's lack of freedom to buy a bus ticket for trip to another city due to their absence of money. However, a proletarian can't buy the ticket does to an objective material limitation, a lack of the material resource, this situation is completely immoral (beyond morality), a proletarian can here talk about their “right” from the idealist/moral position only, by appealing to “fairness”, “humanitarianism” or something like this. Therefore, in the second case, where a capitalist's freedom is restricted, it is done for the sake of the idea of “fairness” and “humanitarianism”, i.e. something non-material. Therefore, so called “libertarian left” is just the more refined, more christian leftists that rejected materialism, and “market socialism” is the market subordinated to the egalitarian morality of universal equality and brotherhood.

Nevertheless, I get back to the beginning and question what formation is supposed to follow capitalism or how it will change. Austrian school, classic ideas are in fact boiled down to that we can't effectively anticipate market's behavior therefore we shouldn't touch it and should let it regulate itself. Free market, economical freedom is thus being a particular manifestation of indeterminism. If we, however, can estimate it, figure out formulas, anticipate its behavior and future crises, this means it is in a certain degree deterministic and not completely free. It followed that the behavior of market actors is also not free, after all, market is just commodity-money relations of private persons. Now, combined methods are primarily used, many things are calculated, there are duties and state restrictions, nonetheless market acts mostly free. And, for example, now robots often play the market instead of people. Not even play, to be exact, – an algorithm cannot play in human sense of the word, everything is already calculated and the result is known. Further automation can make it still more predictable. Indeterminism implies certain indefiniteness, risk, freedom. Determinism sacrifices freedom for sake of stability. Not really like this, of course (see the beginning). Likewise, an ideal model is relevant for tenuous or overheated

gas, same with very atomized society. Absolutely deterministic economic model, which that has 100% predictive quality and exclude any crises etc, would imply the ability to accurately predict market actors behavior and, respectively, mean complete lack of free will in a sense. At the same time, with the growth of individualism, decreasing herd mentality, predictive quality of such models are supposed to even decrease, at least within a single "cycle", because such calculations are based on that all market members would act in the certain cases in the same way. However, determinism is in the long run possible in estimation of longer time periods. Additionally, corporations are yet collectives with their own business interests, and market orientation, market research is in a degree collective orientation. In order to reach maximum freedom, person should liberate themselves from anything collective in both outside and inside themselves, foremost inside themselves. In the conditions of maximum atomization of society (absence of the idea of "society" itself) and moral pluralism, in the conditions where feelings and "humanity" in general are overcome, that's not supposed to be a problem, because of market actors' behavior is gonna be entirely logical, without irrational impulses. Anyway, market can apparently become more of an abstraction or a part of technogenic environment, a background process separated from human being, something like photosynthesis. I notionally call it "queer-capitalism" (with "queer" like "strange", "peculiar"). In fact, any closed system, according to the laws of thermodynamics, is supposed to eventually reach the state of maximum entropy and cease any evolution. With considering the planet a closed system, this is also supposed to be the case for it, however, it's possible to transcend it, so homogeneity would be relative and could generate new inequality and new movement.

Globalization strategy.

The United States is a society that transforms the world, and furthermore it is a source of revolutionary impulses eroding international order built on the principles of sovereignty. (Z. Brzezinski, «The Choice: Global Domination or Global Leadership»)*

Having a goal of transitioning to stateless structure, however, doesn't mean supporting anarchist or anti-government movements in each and every country. Deconstruction should be carried out in the correct order. As have been noted, stateless structure requires deep globalization of the world. If significant decentralization of power happens in a country now, it will be just crushed and disintegrated into smaller states. Therefore, it should be considered which countries disintegration is serves the purpose and that of which doesn't. Globalization requires the world to outgrow national consciousness, was highly cosmopolitan (in fact, the latter is a result of the former). Different level of states development inevitably leads to emergence of duties to protect national economy and makes completely free trade impossible, it's like having the hatch opened in a plane – there would be absence of air inside as well as outside its amount would barely increase much. Equal relation are possible only between the equal. Western countries are being the most progressive and developed part of humanity, therefore **globalism must be unipolar and come from the West**. And the major driver of globalization is the United States. Likewise everything else, countries form a hierarchy which can be notionally represented as a pyramid on the one dollar bill where a detached vertex represents a unique status of the US, it is followed by the EU, Japan and other countries. Firstly, the US is the only superpower, the most powerful country in both economic and military respects, additionally having beneficial geographic location. Secondly, it is a monopolist of the world currency – the only source of the modern analogue of gold. To be exact, it's not even the US as a country but the FRS – in many respects an independent private organization. The highest power of the FRS is represented by the Council with 7 members. The Council is formed through appointment one member every two years (most frequent) by the president of the US for 14 years without re-election. President can appoint maximum 4 members of the council in 8 years which has never happened. Thus, this is a quite stable structure barely influenced by political officials, as well as their ability to take an incompetent decision due to populist or other political considerations.

Thirdly, democracy in the US is quite aristocratic. Powerful political clans virtually exclude possibility of nomination of populists (Trump is apparently the only exception, still, he was incumbent one term only), communists or reactionaries, while high federalism and strong independent branches of government make for them impossible its usurpation as well as leading completely inadequate policy. This aristocracy, on the one hand, restricts the rabble influence on politics, makes the system stable, and renewability of elites and regular alteration of power don't allow to slip into authoritarianism and reactionary conservatism, and leading the country along the way of progress. No one bans any parties, nonetheless the only two moderate parties have influence, both leading globalist policy. The US is apparently the only country where revolution is absolutely impossible. The US has originally formed as an international multicultural country, so ethnic nationalism is quite weak in it (there is white nationalism but it's, however, more vague commonality), while openness preserves the country from conservation. All this makes the US the primary foothold of globalization and building the new world order. Together with the European Union they constitute the trans-Atlantic alliance of advanced countries, political as well as military – NATO. Countries that accepted western values or being in the process of its acceptance are affiliated to these, as well as ones that serve a foothold for the US in the region – Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, also Georgia, Ukraine, Moldova and others. Moreover, Israel, the only island of liberalism and freedom in the Near East sea of islamic obscurantism.
On this regard, western countries as well as their allies should stay strong, cohesive and stable. Further expansion of European Union as well as that of NATO is necessary – that is, Euro-Atlantic structures should keep pushing eastward. On the Near East, it is desirable to expand Israel sphere of influence. And I very like the idea of creation of Greater Israel, even though it's a mere conspiracy theory detached of the current realities – at least American allies represented by Saudi Arabia and Gulf countries would oppose this much. For the beginning, it would be great to smash Iran and promote liberalization of these regions. There are already signs of that Gulf countries are bit by bit withdrawing from the sharia project which, in the day, was needed to oppose islamic socialism promoted by USSR in this region. It's also necessary to flush out socialist disease in South America, foremost in Venezuela and Cuba – these are also being a source of anti-globalist sentiments.
In the Europe and the US, a fight against far-“right” populists, eurosceptics, isolationism proponents and left anti-globalists is necessary. These forces, sometimes consciously sometimes not, seek to make Europe disjointed and weak by plunging it into nationalist conflicts, as it had been until the mid of 20th century, and actively supported by the enemies of the West. It's necessary to try to cancel Brexit, or a minimum target is to promote independence of Scotland, which would return to the EU in this case. United Europe is, in fact, that which allowed to cease centuries-long wars in this region, and the US is the force that supports international stability allover the world. *“Sudden end of American hegemony would no doubt plunged the world into chaos, under cover of which international anarchy would be accompanied by outbreaks of violence and destruction on a really spectacular scale.[...] But phased and controlled redistribution of power can lead to forming the structure of worldwide convergence based on shared interests and having its own supranational mechanisms, on which some special functions in the area of security that are traditionally carried out by government bodies will be placed increasingly.*”(Z. Brzezinski)*

The primary enemy of globalization, progress and, ultimately, the whole mankind is Russia. On the second position China can be put (including North Korea which exists as long as it's backed by China), and islam represented foremost by Iran is on the third.
Any authoritarian regime is going to inevitably be anti-globalist, since it can survive only being separated from outer world. As a result, such a regime will lag behind in all areas and harden its position by means of censorship, traditional values and similar garbage. Like an ant queen which produces a special substance that blocks development of other ants.
However, while the most of authoritarian regimes have a little of capacities to resist the civilized world, Russia and China still can get in the way. The territory of these two countries together

resembles that of Mongolian empire, and these are in many respects being continuers of Mongolianness – despotic anti-free traditions and Asianness. Both these, unfortunately, are still in the UN Security Council and have nuclear weapon. But China at least has buddhist, confucian background where traditionally an antagonistic concept of confrontation between “good” and “evil” didn't exist, so anti-Western sentiment is expressed in it less explicitly and not being something so inherent to the nation. In Russia, on the other hand, acceptance of the religion of Byzantine despotism – orthodox christianity – gave the rabble's resentment some severity and idealism, having created in the mindset messianic sentiment and spawned the ideas of “eurasianism”, the “third way” and similar populist delirium. Among all branches of christianity, orthodoxy is the worst. Almost as shitty as islam. Catholicism is a little better, protestantism is the best. Because of that the idea of Mongolian roots of Russia/Moscovia and it being a successor of the Golden Horde is now promoted primarily by russophobes and liberals, someone may think that this is just a products of bias, but actually the idea of Russia being not the successor of Kyivan Rus (actually this term was made up in 19th century) but that of Mongolian monarchy was originally suggested by neither russophobe or liberal but quite opposite – by one of the founders of eurasianism Nikolai Trubetzkoy. I can assume that the West can have constructive interaction with China, at least so far, but with Russia it's absolutely impossible. It embodies reactionary conservatism multiplied by christian-leftist narratives of “social justice” and put in an overvalued idea. Plus, defeat in the Cold war made it similar to Nazi Germany by filling it up with revanchist sentiment and wish to rebuild the “empire”. Likewise Germany after WW1, Russia was an analogue of Weimar Republic which ended up with fascization and dictatorship, even though in the latter case it is happening in a more disguised way. Many historical parallels can be found in here, starting with de facto destroyed federalism and holding Olympics, and ending with the anschluss of Crimea. However, as it comes to its ideology and status, it would be perhaps more accurate to compare Russia with fascist Italy while China is being an analogue of Nazi Germany, the ideology of which is in fact national-socialist. On this comparison, many apparently get bewildered, but this is actually obvious. It's rather odd that nobody makes the comparison like this. It's got nationalism with total patriotic propaganda, it has books burned, it's got imposing of traditional values, total censorship, surveillance, reporting, tries to establish social rating, it has one party dictatorship, oppression on ethnic grounds and concentration camps for Uyghurs, homophobia and promoting morality... Looking at China one might to imagine how the Third Reich might look today. On this regard, no wonder that more and more far-right neo-Nazi, alt-”rights” (not to mention russkies) are getting sympathetic to Chinese “communist” dictatorship. For example, New Zealand terrorist, white supremacist Brenton Tarrant wrote about himself: *“The state with political and social values closest to my ideal is the People's Republic of China.*”* The horseshoe theory another time proves itself...

Therefore, the most important task is to promote color revolutions in these very countries. Establishment a regime loyal to the West in Russia has a higher priority – in this case, it could team up with the West against China. It would be even better to ignite a war between Russia and China with their subsequent disintegration, depriving of nuclear weapon and excluding them from the UN Security Council. They may be replaced, for instance, by Germany and Japan (or Taiwan which was its member earlier). The objection like “China will demand the US to pay its external debt” are unrealistic because firstly, China keeps only a part of American external debt and not the largest, secondly, this would rather hit China itself in a greater scale. By the way, main directions where China now expands its influence are Africa, South-East Asia and pacific region. So, it can be even approximately estimate where warfare could be deployed in hypothetical military clash at the final stages of globalization. Beliefs in China being some sort of “superpower” are really exaggerated. It is a regular third world country, a sock sewing factory masquerading as a country. The country is ranked 90th in the world at life quality, 330 millions of inhabitants have never seen a toilet, one third of the population live in absolute poverty. As for having first absolute GDP, its GDP per capita is way lower. Moreover, GDP is a quite lame indicator of country development, it's merely an aggregated market value of all commodities and services produced by country regardless of who's

resources are used. By the way, as soon as economy becomes developed its growth rate significantly decreases which is already happening out there. Earlier, in the 80s many anticipated Japan to become superpower, but as we see now, its economical growth eventually slowed down, same is gonna happen to the People's Republic of China. China's competitive advantage is presence of cheap labor and, as a result, production of cheap consumer goods most of which produced under American and European licenses. So, there's no problem for it to have first GDP in the world as long as it sews sneakers and assembles iphones for the western masters. As Brzezinski wrote: *"long-term China's economical success remains in a high dependence from influx of western capital and technologies, as well as from access to foreign markets, and this significantly restricts its choice.*"* Talks about Asians' diligence and discipline which caused economical miracle in China is the fairy tales for adult. Miracles don't exist. The miracle was provided by credit lines. Likewise, economical miracle of Germany was provided after WW1. If tomorrow Asians access to money is closed, a day after tomorrow the miracle will disappear. Also China has good premises for separatism – Tibet, Uyghur provinces, and basically, Beijing and north provinces inhabitants barely understand the inhabitants of the south. All this also may be exploited to smash Chinese authoritarian regime.

And if we don't deal with these regimes in foreseeable future, we will have to deal with them later in WW3, anyway. All the civilized progressive world should make an iron fist and oppose barbarians from the east! In fact, for reactionary and backward countries, perhaps a sort of "liberal dictatorship", which would get the savages into freedom with an iron hand and forced them, so to say, to "replace fez with hat", would be useful. Someone might reproach me to suggest same thing I condemn earlier thereby establishing a new morality, but this is only due to an idealistic approach to the issue. Firstly, unlike "classic" ideologies, immoralism aims to the maximum personal freedom, so the fight would be directed foremost against prohibitions, traditions, moral fabric of society and obscurantism. Secondly, the principle of freedom is not applicable to enemies of freedom, and if one stays within freedom framework while opponents of freedom is not restricted by it – this is a guaranteed defeat in the battle and martyrdom. In essence, this idea has been formed earlier by Karl Popper. Thirdly, the way of evolutionary transformation is too slow, and for revolutionary transformation a political will and readiness to overcome inert masses resistance is necessary (though, in essence, revolutions happen when there is no evolution for a long time). Ataturk carried out a forced westernization, cut heads for wearing turbans, but this made Turkey relatively secular (on the background of other muslim shitholes, and even despite some degradation last years). I reckon that western values, same sex marriages and the like must be put Russian, muslim and other savages down their throats, they must be made swallow and digest it. Fourthly, movement towards freedom goes in cycles, and in order to establish liberties in this process the fight against old restrictions is required. And things that tactically may seem to be contrary to freedom, strategically lead to its triumph. Additionally, dictatorship is not to be confused with totalitarianism. Totalitarianism is inherently collectivist and serves a universal "supreme ideal" of sorts. A dictator, though, had initially been a person entitled with extended credentials in order to promptly deal with some sort of a problem. Totalitarianism is about wideness of authorities' control and power, dictatorship is more about its source. The former opposes freedom, the latter to democracy. It would be misleading to think that freedom is possible under democracy only, democratic authorities can be as totalitarian as an authoritarian dictatorial regime. Democracy is not the end in itself, it's supposed to serve freedom, and although it may in a degree be of use for the developed individualist countries of the West where it allows to elect those who will uphold personal freedom principles, in barbaric countries it will work, respectively, for barbarians. For example, democracy would barely make Saudi Arabia more free if its population remains sharia fans, being homophobic, reactionary and such. Even if all government restrictions are abolished, domestic discrimination can still persist. The "liberal dictatorship" could, however, instill freedom and western values over there. Such a regime is thus supposed to protect individual freedom from nation ("general public"), "society", from its traditions and foundations, by taking all necessary measures. Sure "traditional" dictatorships usually tend to be conservative, collectivist and, as a result, totalitarian, hereof

confusion of the terms. These oftentimes support all the most primitive inclinations of nation, its traditions and norms. Doing so is simpler then resorting to risky reforms and social transformations, and this conservation helps to keep power. Thus, liberal dictatorship differs from traditional one in it being lacked of populism and conservatism, having political will and abilities to take unpopular decisions, so that its progressive transformations wouldn't be canceled by those who the backward nation may elect during the democratic elections, i.e. its actions are supposed to contribute to the growth of individualism, which would make it redundant and lead to decentralization of power, otherwise it risks to degrade into totalitarian/despotic dictatorship. While regular dictatorship oppresses the liberties of minority, thereby indulging wishes of majority, traditions and moral fabric of society, the liberal one gives liberties to minority (creates conditions where these can be taken), destroys moral fabric of society even despite the protests of majority.

In the Near East, as have been said, the partnership between the West and Israel is important, muslims may be further clashed ones against other, so that they continue to actively eliminate each other. On this regards, there's nothing reprehensible about tactical partnership with Saudi Arabia and other Gulf countries, to resist and overthrow the regimes loyal to Russia, like Iranian or Syrian. Somewhere, creation of new pro-western countries is possible, for instance, Kurdistan. Resistance of Turkey should be overcome, a coup may be arranged if necessary (a pity it didn't work out in 2017, but it's possible to try again, Biden recently hinted that he can support Turkish opposition). This opens the way for building oil pipelines to Europe from the Persian Gulf, through Iraq, Kurdistan and Turkey. Which, subsequently, allows Europe to reject Russian gas and oil, if necessary receiving this “blood of war” from other sources and undermining the Russian Mordor economy at the same time (though, people who work in the area of oil extraction in Saudi Arabia, told me that now it's even more profitable to transport oil on tankers, so perhaps it's possible to do without this). After inclusion of Russia or the states of North Eurasia created instead of it into the western sphere of influence, Saudis and other retarded Allah fans will no longer be needed, so we may get rid off them or, to be exact, not take much their opinion into account and bring liberal western values upon there. Though, they apparently start to depart from that religious nonsense themselves. All approximately the same with South American leftists. They can be dealt with at one time with Near East. They essentially exist as long as Russia does, without credits constantly written off they won't last long anyway. In the Eastern Europe, foremost in Poland and Hungary, conversely, conservatives should be toppled and social-democrats and right-centrists (all in all, globalists) be advanced. Generally, something like this. Of course this is very approximate and generalized draft of action, and precise steps will depend on specific circumstances.
I end this chapter up with my English adaptation of communist verse I revamped (plus originally revamped Russian version, since it's a little different):

To delight of corporations
We'll erase morals and nations
LGBT prides are going
Celebrating Satan's glory!

(Мы на радость всем буржуям
Мировой пожар раздуем,
Гей-парады по стране —
Всё во славу Сатане!)

Debunking of moral prejudices. The structure of morality.

“Meanwhile it is singular how long the rotten will hold together, provided you do not handle it roughly. For whole generations it continues standing, 'with a ghastly affectation of life,' after all life and truth has fled out of it: so loth are men to quit their old ways ; and, conquering indolence and

inertia, venture on new." (Thomas Carlyle)
"The majority never has right on its side. Never, I say! That is one of these social lies against which an independent, intelligent man must wage war.[...] I propose to raise a revolution against the lie that the majority has the monopoly of the truth. What sort of truths are they that the majority usually supports? They are truths that are of such advanced age that they are beginning to break up. And if a truth is as old as that, it is also in a fair way to become a lie, gentlemen.[...] The truths of which the masses now approve are the very truths that the fighters at the outposts held to in the days of our grandfathers. We fighters at the outposts nowadays no longer approve of them; and I do not believe there is any other well-ascertained truth except this, that no community can live a healthy life if it is nourished only on such old marrowless truths." (H. Ibsen, "Enemy of the people")
Narrow-mindedness is a social demand" (F. Kafka)*
"Custom represents the experiences of men of earlier times in regard to what they considered as useful and harmful; but the feeling of custom (morality) does not relate to these feelings as such, but to the age, the sanctity, and the unquestioned authority of the custom. Hence this feeling hinders our acquiring new experiences and amending morals: i.e. morality is opposed to the formation of new and better morals: it stupefies." (F. Nietzsche, The Dawn of Day)

In the last part of this book (I don't know whether it can be considered a book, so far just 68 pages, well, say, this text) I debunk widespread moral prejudices and myths which are used to justify oppression of freedom as well as for inciting anti-globalist sentiments.

But first I'm going to consider essence of morality and its inner structure. The word "morality" itself means "commonly accepted habit". Accustomed things are moral, the unaccustomed are amoral. *«Привычка свыше нам дана/ Замена счастию она» «Habit is a divine tribute / of happiness it's substitute*» (A. Pushkin)* Habit is formed on the basis of experience or designed training (nurture). Components of morality can be represented as a hierarchical structure. The lowest and most abstract layer of this model is being the concept of good and evil, these are derived of understanding of the world (therefore I had to begin deconstruction of moral dogmas with review of fundamental questions). It is followed by a bit more specific layer which consists of rituals and ideas that contribute to survival, receiving of benefits or pleasure. Last come personal tastes and preferences. Each subsequent layer is restricted by its predecessor. Therefore, if understanding of the world prescribed, for example, human sacrifice to South American Indians, since it was believed to help good gods to defeat evil ones, they used to joyfully and voluntary agree to sacrifice themselves and their children. Choice between ice cream kinds isn't contrary to the preceding layer, therefore no one restricts it, unlike the choice of sexual practices. And, for example, why are vegans generally more intolerant to meat eaters than vise versa? Because the former have more fundamental idea as a basis – the egalitarian one (which is slightly ironic: hierarchy of an egalitarian idea!) that applies for objectivity, while the latter have just personal tastes. Basic concepts have priority over the derived ones. Additionally, the layer that spans the receive of benefits and pleasure has also its internal hierarchy itself. Its underlying concept is an idea of common good in physiological aspect that takes root in herd mentality and collectivism. It is followed by common good in aspect of collective sentiment and emotions – public opinion. Then follows physiological good and comfort of an individual. And last comes pleasure of an individual. Its basic concepts also have priority over the derived ones. Proceeding form this hierarchy, "rights and wrongs" of individual feelings are estimated. The most approved, thus, is the pleasure that benefits to everyone/majority. It is followed by neutral pleasures. Then follow the pleasures received through emotional suffering of others, and last come pleasures received through physiological suffering (murder). Pleasures received through emotional or physiological suffering and murder have subsequently their own hierarchy: first (in priority ascending order) come the murder of the simplest organisms, insects, then come some primitive fishes, birds, these are followed by mammals and other higher animals as victims, these are subsequently followed by the higher animals that are considered being "cute", then monkeys and then representatives of our own biological specie, i.e. humans and, finally, humans that

considered being “cute”. In this case I mean suffering experienced by people even if other biological species suffer in fact. This is approximately how the firmware of an average biological bot works.
Therefore, nobody care of killing of a bug, for example, killing of a cow is justified by a physiological need, and killing of a cat isn't, because it's cute. Idea of “cuteness” can vary depending on a particular culture, for example it's normal for Korean and Chines to eat dogs and cats (it is just now they cease to do it under western culture influence), for muslims a pig is too dirty and disgusting to even eat it, but it's ok for Europeans, for Indians a cow is sacred, and people eat various bugs in South-East Asia. In accordance with the same firmware, murder in behalf of motherland or some “higher” ideals may be a heroic deed, murder for money is reprehensible but understandable, while murder for sake of pleasure causes the highest condemnation. Likewise, killing a “cute” animal in behalf of “common good” or for food will get butts hurt more slightly than if it's done for sake of aesthetics or pleasure. According to the same hierarchy of ideas, neutral receive of pleasure or consumption to fulfill physiological needs will be perceived by philistines more acceptable than ostentatious consumption that causes envy or pleasures that offend the beliefs based on more fundamental ideals. In essence, of course, morality is a lie, and most of people just try to impose their irrational prejudices.

Over time, this “pyramid” a little settled, partially a bit tilted like an old rotten building, the most abstract level – that of “god” – became barely seen in places, nature and society are still visible, nonetheless these three supporting structures persisted. The task of dialectical immoralism is to demolish this old system and build new one. As we demolish these three basic “authorities”, the rest of the construction, which have grown into the chimera of conceptions, collapses along. So, these ideas have been earlier debunked, as well as shown the transition from the collective to the individual. This leaves us with material existence and an individual. We can't take an individual as a basis because this would undermine an objective nature of the model due to their differences and the inconsistencies this causes. Therefore I take as a basis an objective material existence which can be described consistently, logically and dialectically. On this understanding of the world stays. This existence is not being an eternal absolute. For this reason its complete knowledge is possible, which allows an individual to manage it at will. Respectively, material existence is followed by a physical material individual their benefit and egoistic wishes. And only after this common good comes. The common is compounded of the individual. Technical progress helps such a separation of an individual. The hierarchy of personal good is as following: the material has priority over the “spiritual”, feelings and emotions are the property of an individual that is freely managed by them. In the estimation of those being “right” and “wrong” there is no orientation towards someone else's emotions, as well as common good. The priority of physiological well-being of individuals may be left intact, since an individual is more basic idea in this case. Thus, so that it were easier it accept things further outlined, it's necessary first to accept this new model.

On benefit of genders.

For the beginning, I'll review the concept of such a social construction as gender. There were originally two biological sexes, and as human society matured, certain social labels, unspoken rules, public expectations and stereotypes about how a representative of certain sex is supposed to behave, what duties they have in this primitive society, what clothes they should wear and such have formed. For example, women were expected to have hight emotionality, beauty, passion about some “female” activity. Men were contrary expected to have strength, suppression of emotions, the look “a bit prettier than a monkey”, activity “male” only. It's not to say that no inborn differences and inclinations determined by sex exist, but these differences in inclinations are generally insignificant and have a lot of exceptions from the rule. However, since primitive society had the primitive goals like survival, wars,capture of resources and replenishment of high death rate, everyone was lumped

together with the others and dully instilled in them behavior patterns, interests and skills according to their sex without paying much attention to personality. Girls were right away given dolls, some sewing, cooking, they weren't often given general education at all (later, even when being given, usually etiquette and something humanitarian was prioritized), also they were encouraged to more peaceful games that didn't require any competition and kept as domestic servants and children incubators. For boys, respectively, opposite. This is pretty much how two genders were formed, male and female. It's worth noting here that there were two of these not in the whole world. In India, South-East Asia and some other places there used to be more of these.

Earlier, a few years ago, my opinion was that genders were pointless because a free person doesn't need social labels per se, as well as they don't need to identify themselves as someone for acting and living as they like. Take, for example, transgendersim/gender dysphoria. They say they want to live a life of opposite sex, but this way of thinking itself comes from traditionalist premise of old patriarchal society about way of living having some immanent “male” and “female” states and it having to be determined by person's body. In essence, so called "gender dysphoria" is based on a cis-normative and gender-binary premise.
Hence, in the progressive circles, appeared the idea that a transgender doesn't really need to look/ change their look to fit in the stereotypical idea of society about what is “male” and “female”. The same thing is, however, also applicable to cis-males/females. And despite of intuitive feeling and being contrary to common custom, this is logical.
What's really a sense of self? Where does it originate from? In fact, form a certain feeling of belonging to a community, feeling of oneself being a part of a group, reflection in others. Thus, it is purely social, simian phenomena. National identity, class or gender ones... The groups may be large or smaller, but this doesn't make any fundamental difference. Without these herd social inclinations no sense of self possible. As soon as I overcome the human, the collectivity, I'm no longer reflected in anything and next overcome identity in the traditional sense, the only “I” (Ego) remains. But who am I? I am nobody. And anything (which is the same), a creative nothing. When Moses asks god “who are you?” it replies with ancient Jewish idiom “ehyeh asher ehyeh” (“I am the Existing One”) which includes such senses as “I am that I am”, “who knows”, “doesn't matter”, “I will become what I choose to become” (and didn't really identify itself as the whole existence, as it was later interpreted). In fact, it's hard to put it better. Even names, documents are foremost the identifiers to facilitate government control. The first thing a cop does is determines an identity. But what if they can't determine it? In this case it's impossible to prosecute a person, no procedural documents can be formalized. Therefore government prohibits identity documents forgery. However, it does forge them itself when needed – in this case they're called “undercover documents”, just like the state racket turns into “taxation”. Without presence of the state, not many things would prevent a person not having an official permanent identity or having a few personalities and/or identities (even if in some cases one cannot do without authentication).
The benefit of genders lies in that they contribute to disintegration of the two large social groups into many smaller ones, contribute to decomposition, atomization of society, disposing of the collective identity and emancipation of “Ego”. Thus, **subdivision of genders is at the same time erasing of genders**.
Likewise, “culture” is just a collective phenomena, an abstraction that doesn't contain anything particular. It may be divided into national cultures or subcultures with some more particular content, though these also replicate social collectivist structure, therefore doomed to further subdivide and transform. Any sense of self is an illusionary world built by means of surrounding, dissolving oneself in “collective unconscious” etc.
The criticism that often can be heard is that genders are an artificial and made up concept. But nation is being an artificial social construction just like gender. How many genders exist? Well, how many nations do? They say like extra genders and orientations are diving in nuances and shades. Well, yes, just like many nations, in fact. If desired, it can be said that Masurians are just Poles that just imagined something about themselves, but anyway this would be just generalization and

arbitrary simplification. Both cases is just a way of self-identification and affiliation to certain group, gender is just more individualistic and more actual (as have been noted, humanity follows the way of decreasing collectivism degree). Affiliation to a smaller group is still progress in comparison to affiliation to the larger one., because the larger this group the more is put over me, the smaller the degree of an individual freedom and higher the dependence of an individual on an average opinion of all its members.
Social constructions exist as long as the collective, id est the social does. A simple statement of them being fictional cannot eliminate them. Overcoming of collective identities can be carried out dialectically only, through Hegel's "Aufheben". And cultivation of high number of genders leads to gradual blurring outdated binary beliefs and annihilation of collective identity itself. Therefore, my opinion eventually swung towards support of the idea of genders. The same is applicable to sexual orientation. Such things should be liberated from the aura of importance, because it contains no more importance than gastronomical preferences do.
The widespread objection against genders is the appeal to chromosomes, hormones and such. Well, firstly, nobody cares about chromosomal component on everyday interactions level and everything is defined precisely by a socially constructed gender superstructure and the appearance associated with it. Secondly, in the ancient time, when all this have formed, nobody knew of any chromosomes. Thirdly, there are cis-people with non-standard chromosomal component that don't differ much in their appearance. Yes, one might call these cases "deviation from the norm" and "diseases", but at least as long as these variations don't cause immediate health troubles and objective physiological inconvenience, such characteristics are rather far-fetched. As for hormonal balance and other, it can in fact be easily changed.

Individualism is in fact a comparatively new phenomena. For quite long time, human evolution was based on collectivism, and only later independent conscious of particular individuals began to manifest itself (solely because the evolutionary way of humans is quite untypical – development of ability to create tools which contributed to intelligence development). So yet, for many the high level of individualism, alienation is a sort of stress, which results in the escape in an illusion, conformism, commitment on commonly accepted things... even in some "informal" communities oftentimes "foundations" are made up. Schopenhauer wrote "A high degree of intellect tends to make a man unsocial" and this is accurate, because in this case can't fall for the illusion of affiliation to the collective, in fact it's less of an illusion for others due to the level of cognitive development they have.

Homosexuality and "gay simulacrum".

Let me start by saying that the orientation is not a boolean value "homo/hetero", it floats somewhere on the Kinsey scale, and 100% heterosexuals are rather exception than a rule, which is proven by often homosexual contacts in the various closed facilities – in jails, army, nunneries... Sure, there can be distinguished homosexual orientation and homosexual behavior as something incidental, but the difference is essentially only in that ones have a "needle" on this scale fluctuated while others have it relatively fixed sloping towards one direction or being between (not to mention that this state itself can be determined by the orientation having never been challenged and environment contributed to sticking at the current state). Yet, nobody speaks about "pedosexual behavior" of priests, for example (notably that this is more often the case for catholic ones, which have celibate). In fact, it's rather a lot like Guberman wrote: *«Любым любовным совмещениям/ Даны и дух, и содержание/ А к сексуальным извращениям/ Я отношу лишь воздержание» ("Any sort of intercourse/ Has its content and inspiration/ And as a sexual perversion/ Perceive I only the abstention*")* Well, however, an abstention can be considered a bad thing only if one submits to the authority of nature above oneself.

Since this is important for further reasoning, I'll briefly review here also the history of attitude to homosexuality. Homosexuality apparently existed even in the primitive society. E. Evans-Pritchard noted in his work “Some Collective Expressions of Obscenity in Africa” expressions of homosexuality during juvenile initiations among some tribes of Africa. *“Severe corporal punishments, permanent teasing and mocking, famine, thirst, grueling labor, exhausting dances, offensive insults, rape, sodomy – ones being initiated have to go through all this.*”* Just like in army. Some New Guinea tribes have until now a habit that boys suck dicks of adults up till puberty. These tribes belief that the more man semen they get the more masculine they grow up. For the same reason the elders should have homosexual coitus with young men. French ethnographer and folklorist Arnold van Gennep interprets homosexual ritual intercourse as a “rite of inclusion” in new social group or state. As an example he gives initialization, fraternization, ritual travesty and homosexual ritual prostitution which he considers as a “rite of initiation” of a divine. All this also contributed to the emergence of temple prostitution practice, including homosexual one. It's just now a temple and prostitution are perceived as something incompatible, and many for whatever reason think I'm trolling when I suggest to reconstruct churches into brothels or hold gay orgies there, but in the paganism times these were in large part meant precisely for this, and it never bothered anyone. On all ancient murals of prechristian time, sumerian tables, Ica stones, papyri of Egypt are there the scenes of sexual coitus of different formats. Actually, various sexual pratices as well as taking psychoactive substances were, in fact, among the primary methods by means of which priests “contacted to god”, basically became involved in the transcendental. In the ancient world homosexuality was a regular thing. A question of whether it being “normal or abnormal” wasn't even raised and sexual orientation wasn't a social identifier. It was solely a matter of preferences like what food to eat. Almost all ancient Greek philosophers had homosexual contacts, and some Roman emperors competed with friends who would earn more money as a homosexual prostitute. Gibbon writes that among first fifteen emperors the only one was oriented towards opposite sex and wasn't attracted to people of his own and juveniles of both sexes. Caesar was called a wife of all husbands and a husband of all wives, and this didn't impair his greatness in the slightest. According to Greek myths, almost all Olympic gods had same sex relations. Greek hero Heracles, according to myths, also fell in love with men, for a example, with a son of the Dryopes king defeated by him, Hylas. Greeks divided people in intimate sphere not based on their sex but on the active and passive role. No role by itself didn't humiliate or elevate a person. However, higher social status was associated with the active role and the lower one with the passive. The necessity to often wage a war in conjunction with technological backwardness brought to the fore physical strength and made ancient societies patriarchal. In the military tradition, a rape was a symbol of a defeat, the active role was associated with dominant social role which was linked to masculinity, higher social status and adult life, while the passive one – with the submissive which was linked to femininity, lower social status and youngsters. Therefore, homosexual intercourse in Ancient Greece was mostly between adult men and teenagers, and accompanied by education and mentorship, while relationship between two adult men was usually condemned. Approximately the same was the case for Ancient Rome. Homosexual relations were also a normal thing in China, Japan, among Sumerians, Etruscan, Celts, Gauls, Germans. Shudo (homosexual relations) practice was highly respected and encouraged, especially among samurai class. Shudo was believed to have positive impact on young men, by teaching them dignity, honesty and sense of beauty. Shudo was opposed to female love which was blamed in “softening” of a man. According to Aristotle, among *“Celts and perhaps some others, ...relationship with men are highly prevalent*”*. Diodorus Siculus writes: *“While having women of a beautiful look, Gauls pay a little attention to them, being excessively obsessed with infatuation for men hugs: they have a habit to sleep directly on the ground, rolling over animal skins with lovers which present on both sides. The most wonderful of all is that they easily give in the beauty of their bodies to other without any care of decency and don't really consider it shameful, moreover they consider as disgraceful the one who being desired yet not accepting the gift suggested*”*. According to Strabo, they “don't consider shameful when young men generously waste their juvenile beauty”. Greek philosopher Sextus Empiricus, which lived in

2nd century, notes reasoning about pederasty: *"while Germans say it's not shameful but one of regular things"*. Narrating about the German tribe of Taifals Ammianus Marcellinus (4th century) mentions that their men have sexual intercourse with young men and it ends only when a young man *"having matured, one-on-one caught a boar or kill a huge bear"*.

In Judea, homosexuality and temple prostitution had also been actively practiced for a long time. Prohibitions appeared with strengthening of pharisaical and christian sects, which perhaps adopted the condemnation of such relations from Egypt. As christianity became official religion of Roman Empire, it has interwoven with some pagan traditions and some ancient philosophic doctrines, foremost stoicism, and state church became to make up "truths" inspired by the bible.
For whatever reason the most frequent biblical "argument" against homosexuality is the story of Sodom and Gomorrah, though, in essence, this is the most weak biblical reference to the subject. Firstly, these towns are nowhere said to be destroyed precisely for this reason, secondly, decision on extermination (in case of not finding the negotiated number of righteous men) had been taken before the episode with angel, who in fact set out in Sodom to find them. Additionally, this story completely copies the one from the book of Judges, where, instead of an angel, a levite (priest) lodged in the one of inhabitants' home. Instead of Sodom, events happen in Gibeah of Benjamin. Inhabitants likewise demand to give them a levite to rape him. *"Now as they were making their hearts merry, behold, the men of the city, certain sons of Belial, beset the house round about, and beat at the door, and spake to the master of the house, the old man, saying, Bring forth the man that came into thine house, that we may know him."(Judges, 19:22)* The house owner, similarly to Lot, intend to give the crowd his daughter instead of a priest for gang bang. The story ends up by the levite giving the crowd his concubine who dies after the rape, and later entire population of Gibeah is exterminated during the war. (The levite, by the way, dismembered the concubine's body into 12 parts and sent them to 12 Israeli tribes). This also proves that the town inhabitants were not gays but bisexuals at most. Finally, in the book of Ezekiel we can see more detailed explanation: *"Behold, this was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom, pride, fulness of bread, and abundance of idleness was in her and in her daughters, neither did she strengthen the hand of the poor and needy. And they were haughty, and committed abomination before me: therefore I took them away as I saw good. (Ezekiel 16: 49-50)* In essence, this is a leftist-beggar resentment.
More explicit mention of "homosexuality" (in fact, the term "homosexuality" appeared only in the second half of 19h century) can be found in the book of Leviticus, which by and large repeats Deuteronomy. *"If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them." (Lev. 20:13)* Further in 20th chapter, along with this many other various sins are listed. These include adultery (mentioned in the verse 10), incest, sexual intercourse with relatives of various degree of kinship (verses 11, 12, 14, 17) and bestiality (verses 15, 16), as well as sexual intercourse during menstruation (verse 18). In the same chapter death penalty is prescribed for such sins as: obloquy addressed to parents, enchantment, children initiation for Moloch. So, if these ancient laws weren't for bible guys just an excuse to justify their prejudice, they should oppose, for example, sex during menstruation with the same passion.
The three other mentions of "gays" left is included in the new testament, in the last books that were likely written by church officials that served the Rome. *«Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet.» (Romans, 1:24-27)* We see here a worship to nature and a try to blame some sort of depravity for the decline. *"Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and*

profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine;" (1Tim. 1:9-10) In the Greek original of the text the artificial compound word ἀρσενοκοίται is used, the sense of which is debatable but the literal meaning is "men-lying". It used to be often interwoven with the condemn of pederastia – relationship of an adult man and a boy (παῖς is the Greek word for "boy", "child" and ἐραστής is "lover"). *"Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." (1Cor. 6:9-10)* I'll get back to this verse soon, but so far it's worth noting that all explicit mentions of same sex relationship in the bible relate to men only, lesbians aren't mentioned at all.
Christian church in fact had a negative attitude to everything carnal and secular. And things that earlier symbolized strength and fertility, with emergence of christianity, have becomed to be called lecherous, amoral, shameless and depraved. Christianity, in fact, considered undesirable any sort of sex, therefore many saints practiced abstinence and priests were ordered for being celibate. If there hadn't been a need of reproduction, they would have apparently banned any sort of sex, in fact they did ban it before the wedding (this was actually considered desirable regardless of person's gender). Stoicism also partially contributed to this, which on one hand postulated primacy of mind (which was quite in line with religious concept of intelligent design) and on the other hand recognized authority of nature. Therefore, homosexual relations were declared "unnatural", and the formulation "crime against nature" or "against god and nature" was actively used until the modern time (sometimes it can be heard even now, from rabble and backward trash). In particular, fathers of the church criticized Heracles, among other things, for temporary relations with many women, for his obedience to Omphale (some ancient authors write that Omphale forced him to dress like a woman and weave). Later the dogmas of christianity was adopted also by islam. It might be said that Abrahamic religions reinforced all the authoritarian and worst traits of antiquity. In large part this happened with the decline of the Roman Empire; a state usually always resorts to authoritarian methods in case of menace to it. Contrary to the myths of traditional values proponents trying to present homosexuality as a reason of the decline, Rome used to thrive in the time of homosexual orgies and gladiatorial combat, in the time of Nero and Messalina, while period of decline corresponds to adoption of christianity by Constantine.

Moreover, and this is most important, concern about such questions like "is homosexuality natural?", "does it present among animals?", "whether it is an inborn feature or a choice of a person?" are in fact being distraction from the bottom line and search of excuses in the alleged "authorities". Answers to these questions may have solely scientific research interest but not being argument pros or cons LGBTQIA+.
I want to mark the fundamental questions here:

1. How does it matter whether a person was born gay or became one? What an odd premise that an inborn nature of a trait allegedly justifies it while a free choice of it is something reprehensible? Let's assume a person could choose an orientation. So what? Wished and chose. It doesn't occurs to anyone to condemn someone's "wrong" choice of the sort of ice cream. In this case, it's just another appeal to the authority of "naturalness".
2. Natural or unnatural? All the same. What does it change? Penicillin is unnatural, Internet is unnatural heart transplantation and genetic engineering are unnatural. Cancer is natural, Down's syndrome is natural, earthquakes are natural. Another retarded worship to nature "the god".
3. "Disease/not disease". I am to start with what's really a disease? This term is not precisely determined so far. But let's take a common meaning, basic definition in wiki corresponds to it (in English wiki it's sorta different, so I combined it with Russian one for this edition). "A disease is a particular condition that negatively affects the structure or function of all or part

of an organism, longevity and that is not due to any immediate external injury. Diseases are associated with the dysfunction of the body's normal homeostatic processes. It is a result of limited and functional ability of a living system to resist pathogens". The tries to far-fetch something else is a pure speculation. So, how does homosexuality fit this definition? Homosexuals live normal fulfilling life and do not suffer from their orientation specifically. But let's even assume if it were a disease, so what? Nobody cares about, say, cancer patients, and if a person chose not to cure their illness this is their business, nobody would tell them that they "promote cancer agenda" doing so. Homosexuals more often have aids? Have higher suicide risk? Even if this were so, heterochauvinists are supposed to be the last who cares if homosexual die from aids or suicides. So, this sort of blathering is merely clumsy tries to justify the own initial bias. When HIV among humans was just discovered, homosexuals were really prevalent among those infected. But that was time when HIV was a new, poorly investigated phenomena, somewhere to the mid of 1980s. Since that time situation has drastically changed, gays now care about contraception more than heterosexuals, and there are more HIV infected people among the latter. Also, HIV epidemic is most frequent in such "spiritual and moral fabric caring" countries like Russia, Nigeria (which still has capital punishment or something close to it for "sodomy") and the like, while the situation in the "rotten Gayrope" is one of the best. Not to mention that in the case of suicide rate there is a try to present the result of a negative attitude to gays as the reason. Additionally, not all homosexuals have anal sex. Doctor of medical science G. Deryagin notes that about 25% of homosexual men don't have anal intercourse preferring other forms of sexual satisfaction, foremost oral-genital contacts and mutual masturbation. Similar data was presented by I. Kon in his works. According to the research held in 2011with efforts of scientists of the University of Indiana and the George Mason University, just under 40% of gay respondents had anal sex during the last sexual intercourse.
Actually, appeal to harmfulness of an action is just lame demagoguery. There might be created, for example, a site about climbers or boxers. And post there statistics on how many climbers die, how many boxers have Alzheimer's and comparing all this to ones who don't practice climbing or boxing, or news like "climber killed his mother-in-law with pickax in Voronezh", "boxers beat up Tajik in Moscow Region" and on this basis push agenda on how bad it to be, say, a climber, or say like "ok, it's the business of theirs, people may practice boxing, but why showing it off? All these tournaments, ostentatious air boxing on the street..."

4. "Gays reduce fertility, contribute to the extinction". Firstly, their reproduction functions work well, moreover there are artificial insemination, surrogacy and so on. Secondly, percent of gays is too insignificant to seriously affect demography. Social factors influence it much more. China, for whatever reason, many years sticked to "one family one child" policy for birth rate reduction instead of relying on homosexuals. The most nonsensical are the arguments that since gays can't have children they shouldn't be allowed to marry. As if heterosexuals when getting married are obliged to reproduce. But, the most importantly, what a messianism and pretentious care of mankind destiny? As if ones who write such a thing live and solely think how to bless everyone, give birth to 10 children, feed homeless, send money to help Africans etc. (I in no way assume this is supposed to be done, just examples). I doubt it. And what about asexuals who aren't attracted to sex at all and don't reproduce? Did someone see them to be hated? I personally didn't. A free individual a priori doesn't have social duty to reproduce or save humanity even if its destiny depended on them personally.
5. "Children will see!" As well as a lot of other things. And much more on the Internet, hehe. In order to prevent them seeing " a wrong thing" they would have to be kept in chains in the basement. Anyway, it's impossible to know what exactly impression would affect development of the personality, and if it did, doesn't this mean such an inclination initially existed? Funny that gays specifically is the primary fear of homophobes on this regard. And

if someone thinks that half-naked people on LGBT pride would harm child's “psyche” somehow, why seeing that somewhere on the beach doesn't harm it while that does on the street? When muslims slaughter sheep on the square at Eid al-Adha, this doesn't harm but colorful pride does? In the past, favorite children's entertainment was to watch a public execution on the square, and nothing used to happen to their psyche. Somewhere on farm until today people are used to slaughter pigs and chicken, hunt etc. And everything is fine. So, get off of children and let them see whatever they want. When something is told to “harm psyche”, this should be understood likewise god believers or priests say something to harm “soul”. Precisely under such a pretext, in the past, things disapproved by the church were banned, and the Pope forbade god believers to read the bible. “This will harm the soul” means that a “manufacturer's firmware” will be cracked, mindset implanted by the state, society, church, family will stop working and a person will think not in the way others want them to think. Such things have always been far away from scientific basis, and replacement of an exorcist with a psychiatrist has changed a little. Actually, this areas ought to be significantly purged and deprived of scientific aura with being equated with something like astrology or theology. As someone accurately said: “psychiatrists are just a bunch of underpaid sadists”. Cognitive processes should rather be dealt by neurobiology. Cop, priest and psychiatrist are the three major guard dogs of the state (plus journalists are the fourth). State and its culture used to develop in the christian/religious paradigm. Respectively, things that were previously condemned/banned as a “sin” became to be banned due to their “unnaturalness”. That which used to be “against God” turned into “against Nature”, and semi-speculative bullshit in the form of psychoanalysis came in handy and soon was put in the service of the state and herd dogmas, as well as christianity itself earlier. The scale of the religious influence is particularly felt when paying attention to trifles. For example, just in the early 20th century, there were tries to cure onanism, also, relatively recently (especially in Russia), some speculated that people should write necessarily with right hand, there were tried to substantiate it with some sort of “harm”, “cardiac workload” and something else. But, in reality,this is, again, an influence of old religious prejudices – the left side was considered “from evil”, therefore food was taken with right hand while ass after defecation was wiped with the left one. Muslims seem to have this tradition widespread so far. I'd venture to guess that the reason of inclination to write with right hand is that for many centuries people were taught how to write in facilities run by the church, oftentimes religious texts were written, plus in fact it was monks' occupation for a long time.

6. One more frequent objection is that “in gay family children will turn gay, too!” or this will harm them in another way. The most of researches homophobes refer to, however, are just some dubious correlations based on surveys of gay parents and on small samples. Not to mention that the existence of a statistically significant correlation per se is not being the proof of causality, or sample on multiple ground are taken, and as a result some sort of correlation is inevitably found, like it was in Regnerus' research where seven more groups were compared to the control one. If you have multiple traits on which you compare people, it's impossible not to find at least some ones in which any arbitrary chosen groups statistically significantly differ, even if you originally divided them by the feature of “presence of V character in the name” – “the rest of people”. It's also important to note that this research says nothing at all on same sex families. The original source says that 23% of “same sex families” children lived with their mother and her partner at least three years of their life. In another group 2% of surveyed children lived with their father and his partner at least three years. So, we are told that it's harmful for children to live in the family of two gays because there was found a group that was worse than another group by on some parameters, and 2% of children lived this way therein.

Given the aforementioned, I come to conclusion that homophobes hate rather not even gays but a “**gay simulacrum**”, ones who look “gay”. They think a lot like people in the ancient time thought

of a passive role of an adult man (but of course they don't usually realize it themselves) – from this come narratives like “fag is not one who fucks but one who is fucked!” (sometime it's followed by “you would be made a real man in army!”) Passiveness used to associate with femininity. The literal translation of the ancient Greek term “malakia” (μαλακοί) from the First Epistle to the Corinthians 6:9 is “soft”, “tender”, “luxurious”, “affectionate”, “elegant”, “refined”. In the bible translation «New American Standard Bible» this word is interpreted as “effeminate”. Another interpretation of the word is “boys, the partners of homosexuals”. (Hereof comes a hetero-centerist stereotype of femininity necessarily having to imply an attraction to men). This, in fact, contradicts in an extent to the early christian texts where androgyny references are rather positive. In this case we can see intermingling of the ancient social status based morality and christian antipathy to sex. In patriarchal society woman was considered worse than a man, therefore a man accepting a female role was perceived doing an undignified thing. By and large, this idea used to persist up till recently and in larger part still does today, and femininity is associated with passiveness. Why, for example, a man is said to “fuck” while a woman is said to “be fucked”, but she is not said to “fuck” someone? In many countries' lows, there is even no such a category as man's rape by a woman. In essence, woman is able to fulfill an active role, so that is merely echo of a patriarchal phallocentric thinking. Women carrying out male social roles and using men's clothes were condemned in patriarchal society rather for an attempt to appropriate the social status of men, for a riot. Yet, this was perceived as a “rise” of the status, so, thanks to feminism, it was easier accepted. While voluntary femininity of a man was, opposite, perceived as voluntary “lowering” of his social status. Add to this communal thinking, high collectivism, and thus it could become a shame of whole clan/community. So far, a quite frequent argument among the rabble is the remark “you disgrace the men clan!” (can be head in youtube videos, for example). This phrase, actually, reveals the bottom line. A collectivist feels themselves being a part of a certain community, for example, a “men clan”, and not just themselves but others are also not considered by them as separate independent individuals. The bible apparently follows the same logic: *“The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord thy God.”(Deuteronomy 22:5)* As for heterochauvinists, they hate not gays but rather those who look or dressed feminine, have makeup – in short, use the attributes that are considered “feminine” in a given culture. Of course, christian layers of the culture makes them criticize sex between men but there are way less of these who cares about it. Thus, so called **homophobia is merely implicit misogyny and product of patriarchy**. The only difference is that in the ancient time it wouldn't have been hard for German or Greek to explain why they have a negative attitude to it, why man should be masculine or why women have lower social status. Necessity of the constant war, dependence on physical strength and struggle for survival used to make it obvious. While the contemporary homophobe/transphobe/femininophobe cannot find any rational basis for it, at most they will use long outdated patriotic stories about “sacred duty of man to protect motherland” (I wrote on this earlier, plus in contract based armies gays and transes can also do it – which makes more ironic that modern homophobes/transphobes tried and try to forbid military service for them), barely caught a wild boar with their bare hands or a sole spear, and there is no real need of this. Modern level of technical development makes “masculinity” just useless or at least optional feature. Thus, taking these circumstances into account, the phrase “I so hate fags that would personally fuck each in the ass” that became a sort of meme isn't really inconsistent. Another matter is that those whom mass culture (in large part at the behest of TV) used to present as “gays” are really not necessary being homosexuals, although, due to this influence some may sincerely believe they are gays and develop such preferences or, oppositely, real gays may try to fit in the stereotype created by this culture and make it a distinctive feature of their personality. Paradoxically, all this christian heterochauvinism could only strengthen this phenomena and make true even that originally hadn't been such.

Since I try to do not just theory but also develop applications on erosion of moral fabric of society and its foundations, in conclusion I write some recommendations for countries where LGBTQ+

rights are suppressed... After all, simulation importance significantly increased in informational era. Once, Baudrillard reasoned on the subject of identity of the real bank robbery and the simulation of that. In this case, however, it's hard to commit a crime without victims. Much more interesting is a simulation that undermines social fabric. For example, a man who dyes hair pink may not be gay in the slightest but contributes to the good cause of "pushing gay agenda" (does someone really know how it is supposed to be "pushed" correctly?) Or even bypassing a prohibition by means of simulation. For example, it was just a brilliant simulacrum that got the red-brown butts hurt from Kamchatka to Konigsberg, when a few years ago a marriage of an androgynous person and a girl was held. There was a deafening squeal then, Milonov demanded to cancel marriage, conservative trash freaked the shit out. With formally not being such, same sex marriage in Russia was held! Following to my thinking, marriage doesn't even have to be real – to seem is more important than to be! What really do the red-brown have on their mind as they hear "same sex marriage"? They don't think of two person just come to a registry office or city hall (not sure what facility deals with it in different countries) and have their marriage registered, they rather think of wedding as a public event with motorcade, pigeons and such. Into this category also fall public kissing of same sex (or pseudo same sex) couples. It's also possible to arm themselves, and in case of traditionalist subhuman attack annihilate him (ideally) and get away with this as self-defense (particular methodology and means applied may vary depending on how it's more convenient to exploit laws of a particular country on this regard).

Patriarchal prejudices. The myth of "matriarchy".

Some proponents of patriarchy have an idea of "matriarchy" allegedly spreading and women's "privileges". Let's take a closer look at often mentioned privileges and analyze where these originate from.

"All broads are mercenary whores and only use men!" First, everyone uses each other, regardless of sex and gender. Secondly, precisely patriarchy has initially put women in the dependent position, where they were on the payroll of husbands. Precisely patriarchy made women a passive commodity that had to be bought. Precisely patriarchy spawned such a nurture model where girls are taught since childhood the idea of the need to get married, and lack of marriage is perceived as an misfortune in life. Culmination of success in this system is "to be fortunately married", and criticism often has form like "who would marry you being like this?"

Mothers with their babies making rules, old ladies demanding to give them seat in the bus etc, including complaints about women taking for granted then men pay for them and so on. Again, precisely patriarchy created a cult of motherhood, precisely patriarchy cultivated for centuries an idea of a "weak gender" and an inferiority of women. In the developed countries where feminism won, if a woman is given a sit in transportation, she would rather be offended.

"It's very hard for man to get children custody! The court always supports women!" Precisely patriarchy reduced the role of a woman to that of a birth giving machine and created idea of child nurture is inherently women occupation. Plus, most of men don't really wont to deal with children themselves, especially if it's an infant.

Softer court sentences for women. Another influence of the patriarchal idea of a "weak gender", an subconscious alleviation of a possible menace.

"Women are not compelled to military service". Precisely patriarchy cultivated the idea that "protection of motherland is the duty of a real man", the war is a man occupation and so on (in ancient time it was in large part justified and rational, but it's more important that this idea still partially persists today), precisely patriarchy reduced woman's role to that of a domestic servant.

Thus, all these **"symptoms of matriarchy" are actually being an echo of patriarchy**. You fought for it and you're hurt from it.

In fact, the following happened: In purely patriarchal time women had no rights but this gave them also certain privileges, such as full financial upkeep and others. On the wave of feminism, women

got de jure equal rights, however, this didn't eliminate all prejudices and customs of patriarchal era, didn't drastically change nurturing approaches. The rabble is quite conformist and inert, and being slaves of a habit and traditions therefore keeps training their offspring by indoctrinating them with various dead ideas of the era that passed away. Additionally, rabble is inconsistent. Therefore, various highly prim**a**tive females, broads that absorbed patriarchal ideas unhesitatingly use them when profitable, simultaneously not rejecting the rights conquered by feminism. Same for highly prim**a**tive men. Hence, an illusion of emergence of a "matriarchy". Social changes and ideas of modern and postmodern have clashed with patriarchal customs and "reflexes" of the past.

I' also review here patriarchal arguments on a men's "superiority" over women.
"Men have larger brain! Women have less neurons therefore they're dumber!" Ability to any sort of intellectual activity incompatibly more depends on skills than sex. When people learn a new skill, brain adapts to new tasks and changes. London cab drivers that have to remember 25 thousand streets to get a license have gray matter volume in the posterior part of hippocampus increased by a third during eduction. When people learn to juggle, gray matter volume increases in the areas of the cortex responsible for eye-hand coordination. Also, brain of whales is much larger than that of humans which doesn't make them smarter, while Einstein had quite small brain for a man.
"There are a small number women among famous scientists!" No wonder, given that many centuries lasting patriarchal oppression and respective nurturing. Even in the developed countries explicit infringement had place until 1960s – 1970s in average. In many countries it still does. It's also worth noting that an official equality established in 20th century does not mean that it instantly cause extinction of all gender prejudices, bias, social stigmas and corresponding methods of education. Sufficient progress on this regard became seen just in the end of 20th century and in the West only.
Many also like to refer to the research that showed that men have in average better spacial thinking, better at mental rotation of three-dimensional obkects and more quickly note a moving dot on the screen among other objects, as well as its movement direction. Yes, there was such a research, however, it says nothing about reason of this disparity. In this connection, there was hold an experiment where subjects were told to play the shooter Medal of Honor. Hence, after several gaming sessions, as subjects wasted ten hours playing the game, the statistically significant difference between men and women in determining movement direction of the dot in the original test virtually disappeared. The results became completely statistically indistinguishable on comparison of the group of women who played the shooter and the group of men who were given a more peaceful "girl" game Ballance to play. Yet, with society still having different models of nurturing of boys and girls, with the latter being given dolls since childhood, encouraged to have interests and behavior model "in accordance with gender", men prattle something about inability of women to exact science. The very existence of a prejudice should also not be disregarded. The experiments were hold in which, prior to the test on mental rotation of objects, the subjects were read an instruction that contained the following: "This test estimates ability to spacial thinking. Researches showed that women can handle it better than men, which apparently related to genetic differences of sexes". It turned out that this sole phrase was sufficient for the results of women not being worse than that of men. And the mantra like "there are no women that were great inventors/ programmers/ mathematicians" doesn't say about anything. After all, they may be just not interested (again, due to nurture in large part), and saying on this basis that they're unable to do this activity is as absurd as to think that men cannot knit because a small number of men that do it. So, don't go on about number of scientists and inventions. As soon as gender neutral nurture is established, it will be possible to compare, and then such a disproportion will disappear by itself. So, I'm totally for feminism (sex-positive one, not pseudo-feminist sjw leftists that promote old conservative prejudices under the guise of feminism).

Also, I think such a concept as "female logic" is worth reviewing. As far as I was able to investigate, this is a sort of logic where the starting point being personal sympathy or antipathy,

emotions and impulses prevail. I managed to find more particular definition on Lurkmore (a sort of analogue of Encyclopedia Dramatica) only: *"Woman is always right. Excessive simplification and extremes. If a woman can't win the discussion on a given topic she can always change it to other one and protect her position there. Argumentum ad hominem and discussion of personal traits is especially common. According to female logic it turns out that if repeat a bad argument it can become good. Silence is a sign of consent. "It's absolutely impossible to talk to you" is a separate type of female argumentation used by a woman when she ran out of arguments or each her argument gets a counter argument from an opponent."* However, I see all aforementioned among virtually all my opponents regardless of sex! As have been repeatedly noted in this text, the most Homo are not really Sapiens and take as the basis of their reasoning not logic but precisely emotions, antipathy and such – you may got homophobes as an example. Perhaps men more often try to rationalize their irrational beliefs and more often disguise them with logic (or logical fallacies). This may work with an opponent of their level but this fig leaf of their alleged "logicalness" falls off as soon as they encounter a really logical opponent (like me). All in all such phenomena don't depend on sex but on situation.

Family is an institution of enslavement of an individual.

"The most important source of forming ideological atmosphere of conservatism is a compulsory family. [...]Psychological structure of a servant represents a mixture of sexual dysfunction, helplessness, dependence, longing for a leader, fear of authority, fear of life and mysticism." (W. Reich, The sexual revolution)*

Aside religion, patriotism, nationalism, one more method, by which state and society had tried to turn an individual into rightless cog in a state mechanism, have always been family. The more patriarchal and authoritarian was the state, the more patriarchal and authoritarian family was. To be exact, this influence has always even been mutual. It is, in fact, a scale model of state. Precisely in family "manufacturer firmware" of a philistine is formed, the thinking of state/social slave is prepared. A person is taught since childhood an idea of obedience to some authorities, parents in particular, reverence to them, then this turns into obedience and reverence to state authorities, society, leader. There also instilled other herd ideas like faith in god, serving to "common good", social labels and gender-binary patterns. This is called "nurture", though in fact this is trivial brainwashing and training.

On the one hand, person is taught infidelity, "cheating" on a spouse is a bad thing, on the other hand, that treachery, "cheating" on motherland is a bad thing. Thus, at the top and bottom individualism and personal freedom of an individual are constrained, their self-ownership.

Thus, family is being an institution of enslavement of an individual and, as well as the state, should be destroyed in its traditional form, disintegrated. While in the past, say in feudalism, family was a production unit, subclan relations played a significant role, and prevalence of manual labor used to put most of family members in dependency on a man, now all this is usually not the case. Since 20th century, when equal relations between its members were formally established, traditional family has been losing its content more and more while keeping up its form from the past (in large part because in reality these haven't been equal yet). Unity is possible with only having inequality, what becomes equal is supposed to be decentralized, in other word its components are supposed to get more freedom, increase their entropy. When an anthill has two queens it's split, when a state has two equal power centers it is divided, if atoms in a crystal lattice get more of a degree of freedom, opportunities to move, it loses its integrity. Likewise family is supposed to transform into a more free dynamic form. Under influence of industrialization, family did already use to change – has transferred from extended family to nuclear one, and there are no reason for it to stop changing. Equal relations between individuals are always free relations (not meaning that equalization leads to freedom but that between really equal ones unfreedom is impossible; people aren't equal but this has nothing to do with their sex or such, as have been proved earlier). Traditional marriage is supposed

to give a way to something like contracts as anarcho-capitalist conceptions suggest. But they won't be beneficial by themselves as long as traditional prejudices and ideas exist. The dogmatics itself should be eradicated. Marriage should not regulate either sex or gender or number of parties of the contract or their actions.

Destigmatization of promiscuity. "Cheating".

First, let's take a look at the history of the phenomena. In Ancient Greece and Rome person could have only one husband or wife but this was made due to purely judicial considerations – to minimize debates about inheritance an such – and didn't really meant "monopoly on sex". But since all noble families led they heritage from various gods (as was believed), they tried to save purity of the blood, therefore a ban of **reproductive** sex out of wedlock for women had place. For Roman citizens, the prohibition of any sex with the **equal** in status existed – simply put, sex with another free Roman citizen of make gender. There were no restrictions for men on intimate relations with people of lower status. A Roman could have it with a woman, a man, a teenager (provided he was in an active position). There was also a prohibition of oral sex – to be exact, of doing it to the one of equal or lower status, slaves or prostitutes of any gender could do it to a Roman citizen, to both men and women. In the Ancient Rome, mouth was considered sacral – it was a tool of authority where laws came from, therefore it was believed that officials who do it offend the country. In behalf of them, authorities sort of sucked. Such restrictions were, again, the result of casern thinking, cult of strength and domination typical for ancient time and determined by environment.
Female adultery was expressed in sex with equal or lower ones if it led to pregnancy. If the intercourse had no consequences it wasn't an infidelity. A man could cheat on the state only on regard of its "humiliation" and offend if he took a passive position and such with being a representative of the ruling class – Roman citizens. There had even existed sort of ancient sex shops, one of the centers of such an industry was city Miletus. For example, the dildos called olisbo or baubon had been produced.
With establishment of the power of the church, policy of asceticism and abstinence was adopted. The church justified it with the words on fornication and adultery in the bible *(Deuteronomy 22:22-26)*, but what was really called a fornication in Judaism is the intercourse of a Jew man and an unmarried Jew woman after which he didn't marry her, and adultery was a sexual act of a Jew man with a married Jew woman, i.e. emphasis was on the fraud of another Jew, not sexual intercourse. If a Jew did the same thing with a married non-Jew woman it wasn't an adultery, as well as sex with an unmarried non-Jew woman wasn't considered a fornication. Also, this quote sometimes may be referred to: *"Let deacons be the husbands of one wife" (1Tim, 3:12)* but this concerns priests only. Thus, church creates a model of a "godly" family with monopoly on sex and the sole purpose of reproduction. Another excuse of the biblical quote *"Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one flesh" (Gen. 2:24)* which, however, didn't prevent biblical prophets from having a lot of wives – David and Solomon had entire harems, leased his wife to a pharaoh, Lot's daughters got pregnant from their father, and Jacob was suggested female slaves of theirs by his wives. More particular reason was given in 4th century by Saint Augustine who said that Eve gave Adam the forbidden fruit from the tree of knowledge to eat because of sexual desire. I have no idea how he derived this. The church says this information was given him by a proverbial "holy spirit". But Augustine also writes: *"Today, in contemporary time and in accordance with Roman custom, it's not allowed to have second wife*"*. In other words, he was yet guided by Roman laws (up to that time all inhabitants of the empire except slaves became Roman citizens) while mixing those with christian asceticism and completely distorting their essence. Since only marriage made in accordance with church canons was recognized, all this contributed to christianization of the population. This marriage was unrevokable *"...Therefore what God has joined together, let not man separate." (Mat. 19:6)* and was carried out through wedding – the swearing an oath of the church (and not to each other like it looks today). To observe this oath

being sworn, witnesses were invited, which played a role of the official witnesses of sorts. What we have now is just an echo of a bygone era, a form without content.
With the emergence of humanism, “godly” model of family started to be called “traditional”. In many countries creation of non-christian family has been a criminal offense (for example, in USSR). But in the formally atheistic state religious reasons didn't really look relevant, therefore “society” the god-ling came into play, and the crime was “a disrespect for traditions and cultural values of society” and “offend of feelings”. Thus, before humanism, by “cheating” first cheating on state or empire was understood, then, as the place of an emperor (aka pontiff) was taken by the church headed by the Pope (also pontiff) it started to mean cheating on the church. If a person was neither married nor engaged, their sex was considered not as cheating or adultery but as a religious crime – a sin. Thus, cheating was a violation of the oath given to the church and not sex itself. In the modern time the concept of sin has passed away, but any sex out of wedlock was still considered obscene by inertia, however, since religious oaths lost their basis, focus was shifting towards the physiological act itself. By the early 20th century, on the wave of industrialization, freudism, anti-clericalism and popularity of economical theories, sex out of wedlock has started to gradually spread. In order to cool traditions proponents butts a couple grades down it became called “civil marriage”. Like not really a marriage but a marriage in appearance, “simulacrum of marriage”. The result was that clerical “monopoly on sex” has become an unspoken rule of any relationship, not to mention marriage. The physiological act itself has become considered “cheating” and “betrayal”. Evaluation supposed solely for “spiritual” sphere has been transferred to the material one.

But cheating in what? The one who was cheated on, didn't incur any real damage from this action. The idea of cheating comes from a false dogmatic premise that a person is supposed to sleep with the only one partner, and it's unclear why one is supposed to follow this absurd idea. Perhaps it used to make sense in the middle ages, given the low level of health care, lack of contraception and feudal way of living in general, when consanguinity played a crucial role, and with absence of DNA analysis regulation of sexual contacts and marital “monopoly on sex” perceived as the only way out. Today the world has changed, but likewise with many other things, primary cause of such rules is long forgotten and sheeple move by inertia “for how things work around here”, “ancestors used to do thus and wanted us to do this way”. Today such restrictions make not more sense than ones on who person may have dinner with, for example. One might just as well consider digestion “cheating” or “geed” and urination being “treachery”. It's even possible to make up an excuse like if one promiscuously chooses places to eat at, there is a risk to be infected with something, therefore it's better to eat at home only.

Someone would say like “here's the damage in psychical distress”, but in fact it appears solely because a person already has the prejudice put in mind of “adultery being a bad thing, betrayal and such”. If there were not such a sacralizing of sex, nobody would ever freak out about this. And the appeal to a squeamishness, disgust and such is completely lame, since one barely feels disgust because of the partners their spouse had prior to the current relationship.
Also, an objection is often heard that sex is an expression of special intimacy and manifestation of feelings, love and such. However, it's quite obvious that sex and love are two completely different things and the former without the latter has place way more often than vise versa.
In my opinion, significant subject substitution had place on this regard. A feeling of “being betrayed” is caused not by the fact of having sex with someone else but rather by the fraud, while one is pushed for the fraud by the widespread idea of adultery being “betrayal”. Thus, it results in a vicious circle the exit of which lies in the elimination of this traditionalist prejudice and separation physiology related things from the things that are more related to mind like intimacy, trust and such. For an intelligent free-thinking individual it's supposed to be obvious that in most cases one person cannot fulfill the whole spectrum of needs of the other, and it's silly when relationship or trust being damaged due to trifles like ephemeral physiological needs.

Economic premises also contributed to emergence of the concept of “cheating”. Until the middle of 20th century (at least) the situation had been that women were usually in economic dependence on men. Respectively, the husband's cheating could have for them a potential threat of losing their social position, income etc. On the other hand, a man acted as an owner, so tried to manage those who depended on him, plus it was a guarantee of the offspring being his with no doubt, since there were neither means of contraception nor DNA tests. Additionally, until the early 20th century, the idea of abstinence up till marriage had prevailed, whole system of patriarchal feudal social relations had been cut out for marriage. So, this patriarchal feudal morality has been transferred onto any sexual relations in general. Its purpose is understandable when applied to a person of the middle ages or even first half of 20th century, it makes much less sense for modern marriage and it doesn't make sense at all for some ephemeral relationship. The ones interested in such a morality today are various patriarchally thinking broads who are at a depended position and, respectively, husbands of such broads. Only where lord-vassal-like relations are thriving, so does slave christian morality, though in the relations of relatively equal individuals it is completely excessive. I think concept of “cheating” will fully lose its foundation as soon as last remnants of patriarchal depended relations are gone extinct.

So far, in the thinking of philistines, the old discourse, the shadow of the time and relations that are no more exist, or at least don't for the most holders of such thoughts, can be found:
If a man was cheated on, he imagines some sort of “offended honor” – the honor of an owner. By following a patriarchal practice, when women were at the position of freeloaders, he pays for them in a restaurant, buys them something, thus on his own rebuilding these patriarchal relations and this “honor”.
If a woman was cheated on, she perceives that as a devaluation of herself of sorts, i.e. unconsciously perceives herself as a commodity, even though the time when she was such, in fact, is gone. She may think that “real man” should pursue her, make gifts and such. So, this obsolete pattern of thinking is what the traditionalist concept of “cheating” keeps clinging to.
Most vividly it is seen among highly prim**a**tive people – rabble, patriarchal broads and not only them. Even many who consider themselves feminists can have such a perception, and feminism for them is just a guise to, under its banner, oppose consequences of patriarchal relations that are negative for them while keeping up using the benefits those used to give, and having implicit perception of themselves as a commodity. Therefore, for example, leftists who consider themselves “feminists” fight against prostitution in which they see an “objectification”. If a person feels themselves equal or higher, for them it will rather be provision of services, a favor, however, with having an implicit sense of self as a commodity, they keep perceiving this phenomena from the perspective of patriarchal relations.

Legalization of prostitution. Slut-shaming and cuckold-shaming.

“A human being should use everything created as much as it helps them to reach their goal, and reject it as much as it hinders them in this.” (I. Loyola, “The Spiritual Exercises”)*

As have been said, almost with the emergence of first temples, the practice of temple prostitution became widespread. This occupation deemed honorific and had place among various nations. It was one of the major components of priests activity. So, it's really the most ancient profession. When Jehovah says: *"For I desire mercy* ("hesed" - "love") *and not sacrifice, And the knowledge of God* ("daat elohim") *more than burnt offerings." (Hosea, 6:6)* not the theological knowledge is meant, as it was decided later. The word "daat" comes from ancient Jewish verb "yada" – "to know" that had sexual connotation (like, for example, it's said that *"Now Adam knew Eve his wife" (Gen. 4:1)*). Commercial prostitution was a regular thing but, of course, it was practiced by those who had corresponding status. For representatives of higher classes of the population it was shameful, like to day doing a manual labor or sweeping the streets. Aforementioned logic of domination and

submission was also applicable here. However, the Roman emperor Elagabalus, the emperor' Claudius' wife Messalina and some other used to do it just for lulz. With emergence of christianity and establishment of sinfulness of any sex out of wedlock there were no longer place for this activity either. Also it was associated with pagan practices. Additionally, the church shut down public baths, asceticism and contempt for flesh became vary popular. Some saints never bathed in their lives, and lice was treated as a sign if sainthood and called “pearls of god” – because they drank christian blood and sort of took communion themselves (in fact lice were a part of social etiquette, poets sang about them in their lyrics, and calling someone to go somewhere private and look for each other's lice was a sort of flirting). All this contributed to the spread of diseases, including STD and gave new excuses for the ban of prostitution and promiscuity. That time there were no any means of contraception (excepting rare and primitive ones like, for example, cut out intestine of artiodactyls), so epidemics could wipe out the whole cities. However, this time is long gone and contemporary prohibitions of this sort have rudimentary nature.

Nonetheless, so far exist the tries of various conservatives, pseudo-feminists, leftists, religious fanatics, moralists, fascists and other regressively minded, ideologically inferior elements to represent prostitution as something awful, amoral, deserving prohibition and condemnation. Therefore, I'm going to review their arguments here.
Opponents of legalization of prostitution vehemently argue that prostitution is a source of venereal diseases and therefore should be banned, but actually this only contributes to the spread of those. This happens because sex workers discriminated, put with labels, stigmatized by society and put out of law by the state don't receive normal medical care and sexual education, which leads to the spread of diseases.
Also, opponents of the legalization yell that prostitution turns people into commodity and deprives of rights, talk about some sort of slavery and exploitation. In such a bizarre way christian and marxist narratives have interwoven. On “exploitation” (aka hired labor) I have said earlier, so I only say that ones who like to forbid a free individual to manage their body are the primary enablers of slavery and oppression, who reproach also labor rights. They are ones who contribute to their rightlessness by resisting to withdrawal of this profession from the shadow and criminal field, leaving sex workers at the mercy of criminal elements, and contribute to the development of a huge shadow market. It's just absurd when alleged “feminists” oppose prostitution – thereby they in fact deny the women's right of self-determination. **The true feminism is, oppositely, supposed to support the legalization of prostitution!** The legalization would allow sex workers to fully protect their rights (right up to trade unions), get in the legal economic system and to effectively protect individuals form sex slavery with making this profession purely voluntary.
Opponents of prostitution say it should be banned because it humiliates women. But I'd rather say they are ones who try to humiliate them by putting on women labels of “whores”, “fallen women”, “dirtiness” and “amorality”. While legalization of prostitution enables sex workers to fully become equal, respected, self-sufficient individuals. Everything that gets in the sphere of economic relations eventually being impersonalized, devalued from the moral perspective. Today, due to, again, christian moral background, terms “slut” and “cuckold” are considered an offensive thing. In Ancient Greece, husband might bring home women or young men for sex, and his wife wouldn't come to the idea to hinder them. Poets of that time sang about such wives as the virtuous ones. And given that there is no more various limitations and hindrances of the past, as well as realities based on manual labor one might sing today about cuckolds in the same way, why not. In essence, criticism of “sluttiness” is virtually lower-rank females and males jealousy (the resentment of the latter may be a;so caused by restraint of monogamous marriage). In fact slutting it up, being dressed “as a whore” means being fancy, sexually dressed – in a larger extent than a gray mass of philistines can afford. And here comes their whining – broads, hiding behind some sort of marxism under the guise of feminism, talk about alleged “objectification”, while men prattle something in line with “how did her boyfriend allow her to dress like this!” The same categories also often appeal to morality as well as mix up concepts of “love” and “sex”, and all their relationship are indeed a

barter, and if the market suddenly has a more optimal commodity on regard of price/quality ratio, they would lose their “clients”. In the archaic countries, marriage is a wholesale form of prostitution, and the ban of retail resulted from the wholesale lobby which works through priests the lobbyists. In this regard such countries are the most “amoral” (even with taking a moral paradigm for a moment), while the West is a real stronghold of “morality” since in its explicit depravity a respect to a person's dignity is expressed.
Sometimes also a sophism is used by speaking of this job not requiring high knowledge or competence, and here's nothing to respect, or speak about danger of this job. Let it even be so, but, first,there are a lot of professions where high qualification isn't required, for example a janitor – nonetheless, the attitude to the janitors is way more loyal; secondly, there are as well lots of dangerous professions that nobody condemns because of their dangerousness and never had an idea to do so – say, miners or soldiers. Additionally, the danger of prostitution is in large part exacerbated by its illegal status.
One more thing. One of the favorite arguments against among moralists is “imagine if your daughter become a prostitute, will you also be ok with it?!” Here, again, a patriarchal thinking pattern crops up, with perception of family members not as persons but as the personal estate that is supposed solely to be proud of ot or be shown off it to friends, thus reestablishing own social status, assert themselves. A free individual may earn money in any way they want to, by using any of their skills and inclinations. So, of course I will be ok with it. Additionally, as long as prostitution is prohibited, people are getting involved in sex industry against their will much more frequently than if it were legal.

Thus, opponents of legalization of prostitution, by their puritan conservative leftist anti-liberal ideas that oppose to the principle of personal right and freedom, logic and common sense, impudently intrude into a private sphere of a person, infringe rights and freedom of individuals. Legalization of prostitution is an absolutely logical, beneficial, necessary and corresponding to common sense step for free, educated and civilized society. Be a slut, do whatever you want!

Objectification and pseudo-objectification.

One more thing leftists have is “objectification”, pseudo-objectification to be exact. In fact, objectification is an attitude to a person as on object of sexual pleasure with ignoring their will and desires. Some ass grabbing in public transportation or demand to show boobs/nudes is indeed objectification, intrusive flirting is objectification, rape is objectification (sex abuse is a subset of objectification)... But what's not being an objectification is porn, sexual images in the commercial, advertising, games, art or job in such a service sector as prostitution (voluntary one), stripping – in this cases nobody uses a subject against their will, they voluntarily provide services that they're able to provide. Some leftists consider as an objectification even wearing skimpy clothes, sexually expressive behavior and plastic surgeries like breast augmentation. A leftist pseudo-feminist said on this regard a lot in line with “righteous christians” and other conservatives by calling aforementioned things a “culture of obscenity”. In fact, only a subject can objectify but no way an object like clothes can do it. Therefore they made up “self-objectification”. It's a lot in line with an old philosophical demagoguery like “a subject of cognition is also being an object of that”, this idea rather contains religious polarization of soul and body, hereof such an oxymoron. But having will and desires is what distinguishes a subject from an object. And since objectification is ignoring will and desires of a subject, i.e. assimilation of it to an object, self-objectification is precisely conforming to the leftist christian criteria, actions contrary to one's own desires or profit. When leftists deny the women's right to “exploit their own sexuality”, it's like to forbid a scorpion to use its own sting, birds to use wings or a potential capitalist to use their business skills and “exploit” workers. All in all, the primary idea of plebeian leftism is rejection of the right to use any one's advantages for sake of establishment of equality. Such an equality results in mediocrity only.

Also, there can be seen among rabble and conservatives such a patriarchal collectivist idea that women allegedly dress up not for themselves but for men. And, in fact, various leftists and pseudo-feminists do, as well, accept this patriarchal prejudice as a truth, either explicitly or implicitly. Hereof comes an aspiration to oppose "objectifying clothing". Well, in this case a beefcake "objectifies" himself, too, by lifting weights. In fact, following to this sort of logic one might say that any clothes is chosen for others instead of oneself – after all everyone doesn't wear identical gray uniform. Even if someone acts with such motives these are foremost various broads brainwashed with patriarchal eduction. Body-positivists also relate here – they, in fact, wait for an approval from others, otherwise they wouldn't have needed an entire movement, since there are lots of fatsos who are happy with themselves without body-positivism as such. At the same time, if body-positivists had an opportunity to lose weight quickly and without efforts they would right away forget their mantras about "naturalness" and that "any body is beautiful". If one tried to make up a conspiracy theory it would be relatively plausible to think various radical "feminist" leftists are funded by conservative organizations and christian lobby in order to poison with their reactionary shit the ideas of feminism, freedom, individualism and depravity. Anyway, be it even just regular broads and philistines that distort feminism with their bigotry and conservatism, it would a mistake to consider them feminists. While self-sufficient individualist women dress up for themselves and not somebody else, therefore there's no need to begin with that patriarchal premise.

The myth about rights of animals.

"We have no duties to animals. Animals don't have conscious of self and their meaning is determined by their ultimate purpose. That purpose is a human being." (I. Kant)*

First person who quite systemically established "rights" of animals was Hitler. He also forbade experiments on animals, hunt, significantly restricted selection and encouraged vegetarianism. In the Third Reich, at the top of the hierarchy were Aryans, they were followed by eagles and wolves, then pigs and Jews, last come the rats. Nonetheless, in general it still may be stated that the idea of so called "rights" of animals is left and egalitarian. After a point, it turns to be not enough for leftists to equate all people, so they also want to equate them to other biological species, they even made up a special sort of "discrimination" – "speciesism". It contains a socialist narrative of worship to "naturalness" and commitment to return to a "natural state" when people lived "in harmony with nature". But likewise Nazis, other left-wing ("purely left" ones) have at the core an idea of common good, respectively, evaluation "better or worse" is going to depend on closeness to ideals and compliance with them. And since they have a hierarchy of ideas, they can't have any real equality in practice, some are always going to be more equal than others. In particular, those who at least declares adherence to these ideas are going to be more equal than ones who don't act in accordance with them. So, with taking into account the hierarchy of ideas itself, national-socialism yet was left wing, Hitler as well served to a humanist ideal, he just explicitly declared the hierarchy on this basis, which is usually not openly admitted by the left to stay consistent. And if some people actively opposed to these ideals or were a hindrance for them, while animals couldn't resist them at least due to their inferiority and unconsciousness, the latter were put in the hierarchy above the former. Likewise, things like "animals are better than humans! More useful!" can be heard from animal "rights" proponents. If they are asked better in what those are, the answer will likely be that boiled down to general words like "innocence", "selflessness" or that animals "don't kill for fun". The most extreme forms of these green movements are the ideas like "mankind is a burden of the planet, hurts it and therefore should be exterminated", various eco-terrorism, ecofascism and such. Tellingly, many wannabe "misanthropes" justify their position in a such a purely humanistic way. Thus, ideas of universal equality logically end up with the ideas of self-destruction and life-denial – in the purely christian vein. Notably, there are quite a lot animal "rights" proponents among both leftists and conservatives. They both are in fact degenerates. As a result we've got such a lunacy as

veganism, leftists protests against experiments on animals, fur/leather clothes, zoos, circuses etc. Plants protectors, in fact, also exist in some extent – all these opponents of deforestation or chopping off a particular tree. It already got to the point that some countries banned foie gras, dogfight, soon after I wrote this part of text Israel banned natural fur selling, and if we don't stop eco-swines, all the rest can eventually be put out of law and it will be like in Sorokin's dystopia "Borscht". In fact, it's typical for philistines to have such a pathological pursuit of virtue and commitment to generally accepted conventions, and while a free thinker is rather attracted to wickedness, they are most ardent promoters of everything moral and all generally accepted things (even at the points where they are against these, they are motivated by moral reasons) and ready for any repressions for sake of this "virtue".
In fact, not just dogfights should be legal but the gladiator fights banned by christian degenerates in the past should also be reclaimed. There is no reason to forbid a free individual to participate in a death match. The ones who want to , no doubt, would exist, especially if a winner gets a good royalty. It would be very popular type of sports, I think.

Prior to reviews some theses of beastie fans, I am to highlight the bottom line: questions regarding an extent of animals consciousness or in what extend they're able to feel pain or whether animals slaughterers eventually switch to humans are actually irrelevant to the essence of the issue, likewise "innate or adaptive nature" of homosexuality has nothing to do with the essence of heterochauvinism. Because the laws on so called "rights" of animals are actually mere the law that prohibit to offend beastie fans feelings, these have nothing to do with rights of animals, it's just an excuse. Animals cannot be a subject of law, only an object at most. Any laws in reality can be made for humans only. "Rights of animals" is merely a try to retrospectively put a rational cause on the "framework" of irrational feelings, which it's actually based on. It does not fundamentally differ from the law of "offend of religious feelings"of god believers, prohibition of LGBTQIA+ prides or "political correctness" in precisely that leftist form that's usually demonized. I reckon a consistently thinking person cannot be against a law on "offending feelings" of one group of people (for example god believers) and at the same time support a law on "offending feelings" of another group of people (animal lovers or just people with excessive level of empathy), at least if the individual takes precedence over the collective in that person's hierarchy of concepts, or the material takes precedence over the "spiritual".
Actually, it's quite easy to prove "animals rights" to be a fiction. For example, it's quite obvious that nobody will call the police when found a corpse of a dog or cat in the garbage dump, and cops won't investigate a cause of its death, resort to forensics, look for witnesses and so on. Even if a insidious "animals slaughterer" killed it. Such cases are usually initiated only when an animal was killed publicly or a video of killing was taken and put on the Internet. But if a person kills mutts in the backyard, nobody would care. This, in fact, is quite common in countryside. And I really doubt that in the cases of such prosecution someone ever looked for dead bodies, though, in theory, "no body is not case". On this regard, it would be interesting to see what would happen if someone fakes an animal slaughter and spread on the Internet and thereby getting millions of animal fans' butts hurt. In would be in line with a thought experiment of Baudrillard on imitation of bank robbery but better. A simulacrum would substitute the reality much more fully.

Now I'm going to review the most widespread objections of beastie fans.
"Humans are also animals!" Well, okay, let it be so. In this case they have every reason to act just like other biological species, which couldn't care less about rights, equality and humanism, do. Human being, with being a king of nature and the most powerful predator, has every reason to treat weaker creatures at will, at least by the right of might. Of course other animals have more primitive mental state and needs, they don't need clothes and entrainment, but they act in accordance with their impulses. In fact sundry serial murderers are the people excessive "animality" (at the same time, they often disguise their motives as moral ones). But as we mention social-Darwinism and "might is right" principle, we gradually come to the next point...

"But we are humans!" (We are not animals, after all!"). If we accept this thesis as a starting point of our reasoning, we thereby destroy the previous basis of "animals rights". Concept of a right implies a subject has human mind and free will. It has been created by humans and for humans. An animal cannot be a subject of law, only an object – private property at most. Therefore we eat them, experiment on them, make clothes of them, exploit, test drugs and makeup on them, hunt for fun, train, sell and buy on the animal's market.
Do animals "kill only for living"? No. Many animals frequently kill even when they're full. And throw away victim's bodies. Id est murders just for lulz. Animals are sadists. Also, animals sometimes can easily eat up their offspring.
Do animals "love humans" and being "our minor brothers"? No. Animals don't give a crap about humans, human being is just an object that gives them food and caresses them. If an animal were bigger (a lion, for example) it would eat up a human. Also, it's doubtful in what extent human motives and ideas are applicable to them. Person's own feeling are rather projected on animals in this case, and their behavior is loosely interpreted (but with such an approach, even a car with big closely set headlamps may be attributed with a feature of "kindness").
Are animals "better" and "more useful" than humans? First, it right away raises the question of better at what and useful for who? Only a human being is able to estimate this, so criteria can only be human. Animals can be useful only as food or a tool if humans trained them for this, domesticated, artificially bred a needed breed and so on. Everything you use is the results of human activity.
Are animals "innocent"? I don't know exactly what this is supposed to mean. If it's some sort of religious innocence and righteousness, they're obviously not, then. Most likely, a try to present weakness as an argument has place. But if humans had always taken this into account they wouldn't have risen above other species. The whole evolution is based on that the strong and the fittest devour the weak and "unfittest"/less adapted ones.
"First you kill an animal, and then a human!" Nobody has yet found such a correlation. It's more likely they're killed by those who can't or don't dare to kill a human. And, after all, a preventive punishment is a silliness.
"Okay, it's somewhat acceptable to kill them for sake of science or common good, but not for fun!" As have been already noted, such a logic is based on the old collectivist-religious hierarchy of ideas. And if we are to cater to the emotions of majority, this is a political correctness in the worst sense of the word and another moral dogma.

Let's review now the essence and motives of animals fans themselves. Who are they? They are the people whose center of the brain responsible for care was "set up" mistakenly, and partially oriented towards animals. In fact not all animals but those that a subject likes and those that are perceived "cute". If someone hurts animal, the care center's defense mechanisms are triggered and a command "protect" is given. To protect the only animals a subject likes. They won't hurry to save a cow that is dying of thirst at the edge of the village. Also, anger is caused by hurt of the object of aesthetic pleasure. Here the question arises why last years did it become more widespread than before? I reckon the reason is global communication and spread of the Internet. In the first years of affordable Internet (maybe now, too, in a degree) philistines often watched for a lot of sundry kitten videos, this was apparently the major part of the traffic of an average commoner. Porn, Facebook and kitten videos. Hence, a commoner watches through lots of kitten videos, their sensitivity gets increased, care instinct gets exacerbated and they start to protect any stray cur. So, kitten videos are harmful in an extent :) Surely, general availability of any sort of content on the Internet also has also contributed. Before that, even if someone killed a cur and even in the case they would advertise their actions in purpose, a quite limited number of people would become aware, but since today many things are put in the Internet, animal-hysteria has spread.
It would be mistake to think that animal fans are driven by solely compassion or desire to protect "innocent animal". As soon as one analyzes a large amount of events it becomes clear that animal-liking lunatics take the side of animals in ANY situation and justifies the latter. Once I came across

a video where a kitten swims in the barrel – in fact nothing special, cats can swim, and I think many wanted to test it in childhood – so, even there up crop the retards grumbling like “torture of an innocent animals!!!11” Even if someone was attacked by a dog, beastie fans often take the dog's side or try to justify it in various ways.

A reader might say like “woaaah, you just hate animals!” But it's not even about animals but about moralists and their impaired thinking. And those who say “I'm not a moralist, I don't give a fuck about killing people!” are just a kind of moralist twisted in a degree, and all their “misanthropy” has humanist nature. An animal may be the private property at most, and its killing can be considered in this case as destruction of private property. So, if someone cares about well-being of animals, it would be more reasonable not to promote their “rights” but ensure all animals be put in private property. There would be way less of “animal slaughterers” who wish to buy objects for their amusement. Actually, in regard of this issue, still many anarcho-capitalists try to far-fetch concept of reputation and essentially suggest some sort of ostracism thereby implying loosing on the collective offended feelings, however, I think it's inconsistent and in fact a discrimination. It would be more honest to admit that the owner has right to do with their property whatever they want. Yes, perhaps in this case it's not the most aesthetic and understandable thing, but if all black sheep and ones different from “masses” are persecuted and turn humanity into a uniform homogeneous faceless mass, it will be an ultra-conformism, which is very bad thing.

Veganism and vegetarianism.

Whatever one says but vegetarianism and veganism have never been caused by the lack of physiological desire to eat meat. This is precisely message. The leftist one. The moralist one. The egalitarian one. I hasten to say that I don't talk here about abstinence from meat due to contraindications, intolerance to some proteins or diet purposes. And those who don't have a desire to eat meat don't associate themselves with vegetarians per se, they just don't eat it, that's all. While vegetarians/vegans are almost always leftists with obsession of “ethic consumption” and “exploitation of animals”. They are prudes a lot like christians. They make up nonsensical myths about “naturalness” of vegetarianism, its benefit for health, vegetarian India and so on (this was repeatedly debunked, for example by the doctor of biological science and medical science PhD A. Kozlov) in order to just spread their absurd idea. Also, vegetarianism contributes to the reduction of the brain. But the most important is that if we reject egalitarianism and “rights of animals” on the basis of the new hierarchy of ideas, veganism (particularly as ideological phenomena) loses the basis, too.

For now, it turns out that there is a regular food consumption and a ideologically enhanced “ethic” consumption, it's related to not just veganism but also to boycott of manufacturers that “exploit” animals. The left degenerates must be opposed at this front of the ideological war as well. For example, it's possible to spread the ideas of meatarianism – the ideological meat consumption, spread “unethical consumption” in general, for example support the manufacturers that test their production on animals. It's possible to pick meals that can potentially cause the strongest outrage of sundry eco-swines – foie gras, monkey brain, whale meat, dolphin meat.
Our motto is simple: EAT THE MEAT – DON'T BE A VEGETABLE!

Zoophilia. Coprophilia. Necrophilia. Euthanasia.

I decided to merge a few short topics into one chapter. Moralists, for example when discussing LGBT rights, tend to resort to the sophism like “perhaps you will also give rights to zoophiles, coprophiles and pedophiles?” Okay, let's thoroughly review this question. For example, it is to be

made clear what rights really are implied. If legality of these phenomena is meant here, in fact, law of the most countries don't regulate these in any way. Only some collateral actions can be considered crimes, like, for example, vandalism caused by a necrophile who dug up a corpse. There is no reason, however, to consider these phenomena themselves as a bad thing. The fact that these are not most pleasant and aesthetic things doesn't affect the issue of their normality. Objectively, there is nothing bad about these. Inuits, for example, have a meal called kiviak seagulls corpses are sewn inside seal carcass, it's then buried, and all this rots several years, and then it's eaten. It looks quite disgusting for the majority, so what... After all, feelings are just physiology and brain can adapt to the environment. Even if something is felt as unpleasant by default, in certain circumstances, in case of this stimulus often crops up (or initiated by will alone), it can become a neutral or even pleasant thing, even pain.

Zoophilia. The most of objections are boiled down here to the “rights of animals”, which are being an utterly absurd thing, as have been written earlier. Animals can be only a property like a vacuum cleaner or microwave. And likewise a person may put their dick in a vacuum cleaner, they have same right to put it in a cow. For the same reason, by the way, we can't talk about the right of zoosexual to marry a cow, because marriage is a union of two (or more) conscious beings that regulates their legal and property relations. While animals are not the subject of law, they can't even sign a prenup. They are maximum a property. And in all fairness, it's worth noting that if a notional cow doesn't belong to a zoophile, they aparently may not hump it without the owner's allowance. Also, such a funny argument that often crops up is that “animal can't give a consent therefore it's a rape, wooah!” Well, a vacuum cleaner also can't. Additionally, we don't ask cow a consent to make a hamburger of it. In order to be able to reason in terms of someone's consent or lack of it, one has to at least have conscious of self. And in this case, for whatever reason the cases of zoosexuality where an animal is a penetrator are completely ignored. That's basically it on this matter.

Necrophilia. Well, in fact, all approximately the same. There's nothing bad about it, it's just a matter of personal preferences. The only thing is that a corpse is probably also a sort of property, so an owner is supposed to manage it (or the deceased can denote this matter in their last will, like it's now done for organ donation).

Coprophilia. Here people just peacefully eat poos and don't bother anyone. Perhaps it's harmful for health but drinking cheap alcohol surrogates is harmful, too, so what? Perhaps they spit it our then or eat bit by bit, so not getting poisoned... Unfortunately I don't know details, but they are said to really have a special pleasure. Anyway, it's matter of personal preference and I see no problem with it.

Euthanasia. Widespread yet restrictions of euthanasia also have religious and collectivist roots. Firstly, suicide was considered a sin. Secondly, a certain duty to the state, motherland, society, family was imposed... However, if we admit self-ownership of an individual, we have to admit that they can manage themselves in this way as well. In addition, I note here that I do support the retuen of death penalty but for the reasons precisely contrary to those of moralists, because of the right of free choice and an opportunity of sort of avoid a punishment. Today, notably, even if an offender tries to kill themselves, humanistic pigs will be saving them in order to bring them to their plebeian justice. It's just meanly. *“There is a justice according to which we may deprive a man of life, but none that permits us to deprive him of death: this is merely cruelty.” (F. Nietzsche, “Human all too human”, “History of the moral feelings.”)*

Pedo-hysteria and ageist prohibitions.

First, prohibition to possess child pornography is utterly absurd. Following such a logic, possession

of any videos with rape or murder, or even just child nudes in the family album can be considered a crime. There are an obvious victimless crime (even if children were hurt, it happened in the time of recording the video, not due to someone's possession of it). Therefore, possession of CP should be absolutely legal.
Secondly, the concept of “children” is quite notional, strictly speaking, children reach puberty in 12-13 and, respectively, approximately at the same time start their sex life (the most of them, at least). And in the case they have it with their peers, it's not considered something criminal. In fact, a couple where one partner is, say, 15 years old and another is 20-22 years old is not perceived as a reprehensible thing and being a quite widespread phenomena. But if it's like, say, 15 and 50 years old, this is, for whatever reason, “pedophilia”. So, it turns out that the only age gap matters? But 55 years old person who dates 20 years old one won't be considered a pedophile. There's no logic here. In Ancient Greece and many other places, most of marriages were very unequal in age, and were made with teenagers. Strictly speaking, pedophilia is the only attraction to people of pre-pubertal age, everything else is just a substitute of conception, the agenda pushed by religious morality and leftists which make pedo-hysteria out of nothing. The most absurd is that such a violation of freedom of “children” is disguised as protection of their rights. The rights is when they decide who to sleep with on their own, the right by itself means having mind and free will. While such pseudo-rights of moralists are rather similar to such fiction as “animals rights”. In fact, when someone says about “protection” of someone, oftentimes this means just another violation of individual freedom and rejection of liberty for sake of dubious “security”. The most right decision would be to lower the age of consent down to 12-13. Even if we take for an example some children, the harm allegedly caused by pedophiles to them can be questioned. I can assume the harm can be caused in the case of penetration, but it's doubtful that oral sex (without coercion), active role or suggestion to touch a dick from a pedophile could harm them. Fairy tails about “harm to mental state” are the far-fetched speculations, especially given that psychical distress and discomfort are in this case possible solely in case of a priori presence in mind an idea about this act as a bad thing. Likewise for one who consider a homosexual intercourse a bad thing, involvement therein would cause a distress, while for one who doesn't have such a bias it would have as much of importance as to drink a glass of water. Foucault, when describing life of 18th century, mentions that a field worker in countryside might pay domestic kids for oral sex. It doesn't look like their "mental state" was somehow broken by this. Thus, such sundry pedo-triffles, if they are not followed by the direct coercion, of course should also be decriminalized.

And the last thing. There should be no age restrictions on buying alcohol, cigarettes, other substance or restriction on access to some content, no age labeling if production. It's just another ageism, relic of patriarchal hierarchy and violation of personal freedom under the guise of “protection” or speculations on an abstract “psyche”. If a teen wishes to buy something, this alone means they are emancipated enough for it.

Abortion.

Since opponents of abortion yet exist, I'm going to briefly debunk the arguments of theirs. All these are usually boiled down to sophistry about “murder”and a try to equate a fetus to a full-fledged human being. But if a fetus is a human being, an egg or yolk is a chicken, then, a sonogram is child porn, carrot seeds is a carrot and so on. Additionally, accepting equality based on a single shared feature, like belonging to human beings, is a logical fallacy. Likewise it's acceptable to disconnect a person from life support in case of irreversible coma and such, it's okay to get rid off an underdeveloped embryo. In the middle ages, by the way, when abortion was completely banned, the practice of drowning infants during baptism was widespread. It was believed that a baptized infant would go to heaven anyway, so it was perceived a well alternative to death from starvation, for example. Additionally, an unsolicited fetus can be considered as a parasite. A person has right to

manage their body in any desirable way, as their property, so has also full right to resort to all means to expel a parasite from their property. It's not a problem of theirs that it like a tapeworm or something is not viable outside the human body. So, a free individual might say: Get out of my property, fetus!
Actually, humanity ought to overcome such a savagery as pregnancy and childbirth, which only spoil body shape and health, and start to breed people out of vials.

One more thing. For countries that try to forbid abortion, apart of a matter of course like its underground practice, I's recommend the following method of resistance: smoke, drink, get stoned during pregnancy! Let the state and traditional family values proponents, who want to increase nation livestock, get from you at most a replenishment for a cabinet of curiosities!

Cannibalism.

The idea that eating representatives of one's own specie is a bad thing has no rational basis. An implied murder is seen as the primary argument against it, but cannibalism is not really necessarily supposed to be entailed with it. There would be nothing awful if bodies of the recently deceased were recycled into canned goods. Also, it's possible to make meal of aborted fetuses – they are clandestinely sold and cooked in China, and considered a delicacy. I never understood the reaction somewhere in movies and such like when someone realizes they ate human meat and, like, gets thrown up. That's nonsense. Served prettily, it would be look as delicious as any other meat, and even at the moment of eating isn't supposed to cause any disgust. If not intentionally overthinking it and worry yourself, of course. Objections like “we would act like savages doing so” is also quite superficial, since savages used to do it primarily due to lack of food. And likewise hunt turned out of domestic need into an entertainment for elites, eating human meat might follow similar way. Also, since recently, there appeared a popular objection against cannibalism that says human meat contains prions which cause nervous system diseases that were discovered among some tribes who practiced cannibalism. Well, firstly, these prions are contained predominantly in brain, which was eaten, apparently raw, by those tribes, and this protein can likely be destructed in thermal treatment processes. Secondly, nobody proved that their diseases were caused directly by eating human meat, there are quite many cases of cannibalism in history, in the time of starvation, war etc, but there's no information about disorders caused by it. Intensity those tribes resorted to such a food is also unknown. In fact, prion diseases do occur in a number of other animals as well, for example, among cows, though cows obviously don't eat each other. All in all, meat of other animals we eat can contain also infection, it's just checked before selling. Therefore, I don't consider prions an unbridgeable obstacle and sufficient argument against cannibalism.

Legalization of drugs.

Opponents of the legalization usually tell all approximately the same set of scary stories, which, in their opinion, justify such prohibitions. Let's review it in details.

Heroin. Reputation of heroin as a substance destructive for health is not compatible with facts. In the early 20th century heroin was prescribed to children for cough. Many had for decades taken morphine, the lower qualitative analogue of heroin. For example Howard Hughes, the first (or second) billionaire in the world, and Lewis Carroll, the author of “Alice adventures in Wonderland” took morphine. No doubt, everyone heard of people getting addicted to heroin after first dose, saw those pictures “before and after”. But how are things in reality? In reality heroin is absolutely... harmless. The harm is caused by impurities the illegal street production is filled with, unhygienic conditions it is taken in, extremal excess of the norm, withdrawals, which cause high overexertion

of the whole organism. Person can take pure heroin the whole life and stay absolutely healthy person if they uphold the norm.
By norm I understand not driving organism into the state when its natural system of dopamine production is substituted by the artificial (heroin) one. This norm is personal for each person but I can guess with high probability that consumption of a recreational dose once a quarter cannot cause harm, like a cup of wine on holidays.
What are narcologists' estimations of heroin's effects based on? On observation of their clients that have poor physical condition. What did make these people to become like this? It's a result of consumption of poisonous admixtures for many years in awful unhygienic conditions. Narcologists say that heroin drove their clients into such a state. It's not true. This was done by toxic mixtures that contained heroin. They took these mixtures for years in huge amount.
If on the basis of these results it's possible to say that pure heroin has such an effect, similarly health of hobos, who drink alcohol surrogates for years, can be estimated, and to say, on the basis of received data that the reason of these people's condition is alcohol. And conceal the quality of the alcohol, its amount and frequency. With not upholding to the norm of consumption, even consumption of honey can cause a negative effect. If you eat a kilogram of honey a day you'll have problems. If honey isn't pure but consists of toxic admixtures there will be still more harm. But it would be the harm caused not by honey but by quantity abuse and toxic admixtures. By the way, honey sold on the streets is diluted by traders with various foreign material, in the best case with sugar, but also chalk, starch, sometimes sawdust can be added. Now imagine what is substance diluted with out of law – the situation there is way worse.
By the way, ethanol by itself is much more harmful. Sometimes they say about health benefits of wine, but here's meant the benefit from substances it contains. There is a meal, kuchnar, which is milled opium poppy bulbs mixed with honey or jam. Hence, speaking about benefits of wine because it contains tannins and flavonoids is like to speak about benefits of kuchnar because it contains honey or jam. While pure heroin (diacetylmorphine) by its nature is a harmless substance. It's another issue that it's almost impossible to buy pure heroin in the conditions of prohibition, anyways, it's not the issue of the substance quality. To have accurate idea about a substance one has to consider it in its pure form. Estimation of a surrogate can't be considered an estimation of the substance.
LSD/psychedelics. LSD is the most harmless substance of all known. Until 1970s the psychedelic wasn't banned, and scientists could freely experiment with it. In all this time, since 1943, the time of discover of its psychoactive effect, there hadn't been found harm to health. LSD doesn't embed itself in organism like heroin and many other. Quickly and completely excreted from the body in a natural way. It has no side effects like hangover. As researchers themselves claim, it's a surprisingly safe substance. Science doesn't know another such. As an indicator: if person a thousand times exceeds the dose of any substance, be it air or food, salt or water, they will either be seriously hurt or die. The only known substance with unknown lethal dose is LSD. Cases of one-time consumption of value 1500 times exceeding the dose. This, however, doesn't mean any amount of it may be taken without worries – with taking too high dose person can get off of reality too much and, for example, jump in the window thinking they can fly. Other psychedelics can have their own peculiarities, for example, taking big amount of liquid along with ecstasy can lead to coma. Nonetheless, if you put your mind in it and don't abuse it, it's quite harmless substance. Statistics of 1960s made during experiments says that 99,6% who took LSD under observation of scientists had no health troubles. Only 0,18% had psychosis. 0,12% expressed the desire of suicide. 0,04% really killed themselves. It was noted that who LSD negatively affected either already had mental problems or were in depressed state prior to consumption.
If the two groups of people are taken where one consumes LSD for ten years while another ethanol, in the latter case there will be incomparably more harm to health. And yet ethanol is a good old alcohol. While LSD is an awful drug. LSD is by its nature unable to cause physiological addiction. Even narcologists, who's income depends on whether they find an addiction or not, have to admit: it doesn't cause physiological addiction. LSD also has good perspectives in medicine.

LSD has also an effect known as “expanding conscious”. Under its influence, thinking oftentimes becomes deep, people's creative abilities are unlocked, alternative outlook perspective appears, open-mindedness increases. Psychedelics sort of remove blinders. Francis Crick said he discovered DNA encoding principle, for which he got Nobel prize, under influence of LSD. Another Nobel laureate of 1993 Kary Mullis claimed he made his discovery thanks to LSD. Apple founder Steve Jobs said that decision to try LSD was for him one of the most important in his life. Bill Gates, the Microsoft founder, implicitly admitted the same. Creator of LSD Hoffman at his one hundred years anniversary said: “LSD is just a tool that helps us to become those who we are meant to be”. However, here's easy to get into delusion that psychedelics in some miracle way discover the absolute truth or give new knowledge. Yes, they help to go beyond stereotype thinking patterns but this is yet a pure biology, influence happens quite indiscriminately and brain can easily get into the type 2 error in its analysis – take false hypothesis as a correct one – this can cause religious revelations, conspiracy or “deep meaning search syndrome”. Therefore psychedelics in ancient time were often taken by priests, thereby getting their “divine revelations”. Although drug users who abuse psychedelics or mushrooms often have many accurate thoughts, they almost always get carried away into some sort of mysticism or “ deep meaning search syndrome”. Additionally, the result of this “expansion” of conscious will depend on initial level of person's knowledge and where their thinking is directed to, there is no place for some fundamentally new knowledge here, therefore one who worked with DNA can produce its encoding principle but a dull-witted simpleton will at most generate another religious nonsense. A researcher tried to write down “revelations” that came under LSD effect, and the result turned out to be some bunch of gibberish. Nonetheless, LSD is fine as an amusement if not abused.

Cocaine. When comparing pure cocaine and pure ethyl (alcohol), the latter substance is by all accounts more harmful than the former. Cocaine doesn't cause physiological addiction. Alcohol does. Even with immoderate consumption of cocaine it doesn't cause hangover. Immoderate consumption of alcohol guarantees hangover. Person under influence of alcohol is more dangerous, they aren't responsible for their actions and can not remember anything at all next day. Under influence of cocaine, person thinks clearly, perception of the outside world is not slowed down but, oppositely, activated. It also diminishes fatigue, dulls pain. Effects of ethanol and cocaine are similar as it comes to influx of activity, removal of fear. But while person under ethanol thinks worse than before taking it, under cocaine is precisely opposite – this substance sort of focus thoughts.
Incan rulers understood: the more shallow the mass thinks the easier to manage it. Therefore, cocaine was allowed only for elite – priests and leaders. Commoners were allowed to chew coca leaves only in exceptional cases, prior to fight or messenger with an urgent message. Unauthorized consumption of coca, without special allowance, was strictly prohibited. Breaking thins prohibition was considered a serious crime.
Even if it causes some harm, it's less than that from alcohol. Legalization makes it even lower. The primary menace of cocaine legalization for the state: it would get too many too much thinking citizens. Traditional system of power would be impossible. Therefore the state thinks: “We don't need smart ones, We need loyal ones”.

Cannabis. In order to not speak much, I'll just say that nicotine is more harmful than cannabis. Cannabis doesn't cause addiction. Aside psychoactive effect, cannabis has curative one. There is also harm from cannabis bit it's less that of nicotine and incomparable with alcohol. In the East cannabis is an analogue of dry wine in wine-growing regions of Europe.
Danger of cannabis for the state is that it sets a contemplative mood to a person. If cannabis were given to a circus animal, it would still make the tricks but less promptly.

“If drugs become legal everyone will get addicted and crime rate will grow!” No. Practice of decriminalization and legalization shows that quantity of drug addicts and crimes only decreased.

Good results were reached in Portugal, Netherlands and other countries. Additionally, crimes are in large part caused by expensiveness of drugs, in case of legalization, their price will quickly drop down, while quality and awareness of their right consumption will grow. The prime cost of heroin dose is some cents, for example. In Dutch hospitals heroin addicts get a dose for free. And, after all, if someone dies because of drugs it is just that person's problem – a person is alone responsible for themselves and may manage themselves in any way. Nobody bans alcohol because of drunkards, for instance. A free individual doesn't need state's or society's custody. Therefore, absolutely all drugs should be legalized, and also remove ban of any sort of commercial (including commercial of alcohol and cigarettes).

Free gun ownership.

In the ancient time, all free citizens might posses weapon, it was forbidden for slaves only. However, as all country's inhabitants became citizens, including slaves, it resulted, in fact, in some sort of averaging, but since there were much more slaves, everyone turned to be closer to slaves in their status, instead of slaves to be closer to free citizens. It's like to mix a cup of wine and barrel of water – the result will be closer to water. As a result, free possession of arms was banned in most countries, due to consideration of keeping power as well. It became to be justified by that everyone will allegedly be killing each other. Though, by and large, homicide rate depends rather on country's level of development itself, and there are much more murders commuted by means of household objects – from kitchen knives and axes to stools. At he same time the crime rate is less where is a probability of citizens being armed. As for those who plan a murder, they will be able to illegally get everything they need anyway. Prohibition of firearms possession because of particular offenders is like prohibition of cars because of drunk drivers. Possession of firearms should be legalized everywhere and completely.

Gambling.

Gambling was initially oppressed by the church, it was a part of the agenda for fighting paganism. The thing is, in pagan time the practice of divination and prophecy was widespread. In particular dice as well as cards might be used for this. Also people often resorted to astrology (in particular, biblical magi became aware of nativity of messiah precisely this way), though, in fact, any objects might be used for this, the bottom line was having certain randomization as the basis. *“"Of Hazard"—that is the oldest nobility in the world” (F. Nietzsche)* A religious ban have been subsequently replaced with a secular state's ban and, as a result, some countries still have restriction on activity of casino and slot machines, or these restrictions were restored at first opportunity, like in Russia, for example. They try to justify it with presence of some harm, but, as always, it's merely an excuse for irrational prejudice – after all, nobody forbids to play the market or bid, so why is it supposed to be different with casino? Such prohibitions and restrictions must be completely abolished.

Dress code as an instrument of oppression of personal freedom.

Particularly in Russia, for last ten years started restoring a soviet practice of school uniform, and this is being another outrageous crime against freedom and individualism. First, this is levelling and egalitarian despotism, secondly, it's not better than how Nazis forced Jews to wear yellow Star of David in concentration camps. Any sort of school uniform as well as any other clothes restrictions in schools must be canceled.
I might be argued that dress code is in use in many instances, so is it also should be canceled? I

think everything depends on how much it's necessary. For example, in army there is a need to distinguish allies from enemy. Also, perhaps, in some cases there is a need to distinguish a worker in charge from everyone else, for example in police or bank. But there is absolutely no such a serious need in schools. Someone might take as an example the uniform in some private elite schools, but it's worn rather as an indicator of higher status, not for levelling, and if someone don't want to wear it they may not wear it, at least there should be not any coercion. Another frequent objection is that like without uniform there will income inequalities be seen and poor children will be harassed. What a lame excuse! A thousand of reasons aside clothes can be found for harassment in school. Plus, as have been said, it's purely neo-soviet egalitarian logic, a try to level everyone by adapting to the most deplorable ones. Likewise, following this logic, everyone might be forced to wear an identical prison jumpsuit on the streets, so to ensure anyone isn't better than others.

Eugenics and cloning.

For whatever reason, there is the idea widespread that eugenics is something inherently bad inevitably related to Nazis (just because they first tried to practice it), though positive eugenics, the ability to improve and modify human being, is essentially a very good idea. The primary objection on this matter is usually boiled down to the issue who's up to decide what's "improvement" and what is not, and what exactly modifications are needed. My answer is simple – an individual themselves, or also perhaps parent of an upcoming child. It's not even necessarily to be "improvements", any desirable tuning in general. I think with genetic engineering development it will be quite real. It will be possible to pick a race or any other parameters. And no coercion on the pretext of saving a certain phenotype is needed. Thus, eugenic research should be destigmatized and supported. Actually, I'm totally for artificialness instead of naturalness. With having directed design of human being, though, the question might be raised on isn't their free will violated by having their nature determined in advance, but in case of random set of circumstances, when it's all done, the degree of freedom is essentially the same.

Myth on "islamization" of Europe.

"The short-sighted policy based on desire to save purity of blood of the first citizens without any admixtures had stopped development and accelerated fall of Athens and Sparta. But ambitious Roman genius had sacrificed vanity for ambitions: it found it more prudent and more honorable to learn virtues and merits from everywhere they're ever found – from slaves, foreigners, enemies and barbarians." (E. Gibbon)*

Various far-right populists, alt-rights, euroskeptics and other nationalists in their efforts to undermine globalization processes spread this absurd myth, and since it's important precisely in the context of globalization and building the new world order, it's worth to review it as well.

For starters, number of muslims in European Union is from 3.3% to 5%, in the whole Europe it's 6% taking into account Bosnia, Albania and such (I'm not going to insert links, since it doesn't fit much for the book format), in certain countries there are a little more, the majority is concentrated in large cities. This number includes everyone who formally professes islam, number of fundamentalists is still less. In fact, in a place like Moscow, it's all virtually the same, plus because of national republics there are still more muslims in Russia. Also, lower birth rate among muslims born in Europe further demonstrates assimilation processes going on. So, it's hard to say about some sort of absorption of European culture by islam one. With even ignoring all complexity of cultural merge this would take centuries. There rather present certain fashion for islam fundamentalism as a mean of self-identification of insignificant groups of islamic population, and some hostile forces like Iran broadcast this idea, like earlier USSR used to broadcast "anti-

imperialist" idea, and, as a result, there were various left-wing terrorists like IRA. But as soon as the cold war ended, all these organizations somehow fell into disrepair right away (did funding cease?) If we take a look at statistics of terror attacks in Europe, it's seen that the various left-wing used to commit them until 1990s, and just later islamist became to prevail. Despite that Europe has accepted migrants since 1960s, talks of this started off mostly since 2011, with influx of refugees from Libya and Syria into Europe. Which indicates artificial nature of this hysteria incited by right populists, journalists seeking sensationalism, and supported by anti-Western propaganda. Terrorism is one of political tools, so I won't be surprised if it become known that Russia, Iran or some other side interested in destabilization of Europe, and that sees its benefit in bringing into power far-right and euroskeptics like AfD, Marine Lumpen and others, provides support for various allah fans on the trucks. It's not to say I'm completely sure of this, but it's possible.
Another trick often used is mixing together concepts of refugees and migrants. These are two completely different categories with completely different legal status. A migrant gets a temporary residence permit with having grounds for it (job, marriage, education, investments and such) and further perspective to obtain citizenship 5 years later, while a refugee gets a temporary shelter (if its provision is approved for them), in accordance with Geneva convention, for the time the war waged in their country/region of residence. As the situation is stabilized, they are sent back. Also, as long as application for refuge is pending, refugees are placed in special camps, which are in fact a jail / colony settlement.

Many also like to compare with Roman Empire and look for some historical parallels. They be like: there were such a thriving empire, barbarians came and destroyed it. But, for whatever reason, many circumstances are ignored, for example, that the practice of so called "barbarians" recruitment in Roman army, which became widespread since 3-4th century only, was preceded by process of disintegration and strifes. While today in Europe we see the processes of integration within the EU and Euro-Atlantic structures that have never had place earlier (up till the mid of 20th century). In fact, Rome included Gauls, Germans and other in its army in frontier regions precisely due to its weakening, in the time when it couldn't already conquer them. Id est, this is a result of the empire's weakening, not a reason of that. It makes still more nonsensical the comparison of refugees with giving defense and control over the borders to the armies of potentially hostile barbarian/German states. Also, the fact is ignored that after the fall of the Roman empire, precisely barbarians tried to imitate Roman culture, precisely barbarians converted to christianity (that had become an official religion of the Rome till that moment), and not vise versa.

I'm going to add here also regarding crime rate which allegedly rises because of refugees that are said to rape everyone. Most often Sweden is referred, but it actually just has different criteria of rape, and each case is registered independently, here are the higher numbers. Such refinements are gradually introduced by other European countries, too. As a result, Iceland that has no refugees at all, turns to be fourth country with highest rape rate in Europe. Also, propagandist media often call any sort of sex abuse a "rape" which causes extra confusion. And if we take a homicide rate, Russia is around 25th position, while France, Germany, Sweden are closer to the end of the list. Even if it were said that Russian also has many muslims, the comparison might be made with Belarus or Ukraine which don't make much difference from Russia on this regard. And as for refugees more often committing crimes, I'd say that crimes rate in the lower social strata is higher in any country.

So, sooner Saudi Arabia and Iran will be westernized, and LGBTQIA+ prides will sublimely follow streets of Riyadh and Tehran, trampling koran in the dirt!
Actually, we should combat islam, as well as any religious, conservative or leftist obscurantism. And there should be as many a caricature of the prophet and mockery of any religion as possible.

Victimness.

The desire to derive the concept of freedom from feelings sometimes also leads to the substitute of the idea. Thus, for example, any usage of racial slur is identified with “racism”. Likewise, a “native American” from Bolivia labeled me as a “racist” because of the epithet “red ass”. And also muslims for last years started to frequently use the term “islamophobia”. Though, racism, in the scheme of things, means the belief in superiority based on a race and not using some epithets. Likewise, if I have a bone to pick with a fat guy, I might call him a “fat ass”, and according to leftists logic it would be “fatphobia”, though the core of my objection might be not in his weight. For example, “red ass commie”, “nationalist fatso Prosvirin” – the emphasis is on the adjective, not the noun. After all, it would be more correct to call “commiephobia”, “nationalistophobia” and such, though this opens Pandora's box, and it's then also possible to blame leftists in “fascistophobia” etc. (Yes, it can be noted here that the freedom principle is not applicable to enemies of freedom, but leftists are essentially enemies of freedom themselves and their understanding of it is incorrect.) In essence, the humanist thought eventually comes up with that it tries, in fact, to forbid not just to hate but have negative or intolerant attitude to anything. So, the real discrimination like homophobia, for example, should be distinguished from a putative one, which can be boiled down to merely the offended feelings.

Practical overcome of morality.

Despite the logicalness of all aforesaid, it will unlikely change someone's mind on something or will be sufficient to move from theory to practice. The majority, alas, is quite irrational and guided by emotions, not logic. And even with being guided by logic and completely realizing fictional nature of morality and prejudices, it often may be not that easy to step over some of them because brain will be generating discomfort on each action that trespasses habitual sphere. This can be overcome, ultimately, by will alone. After all, brain is similar to a neural network (well, or a neural network to the brain, it depends on how you look at it) – can learn one or other reactions and adapt to environment. But, anyway, this is preceded by rationalization and conviction in rightness of an action. Rationalization by itself doesn't removes discomfort, likewise neural network doesn't learn to react correctly at the first cycle of learning. The thought like “this feeling is illogical” is unable by itself to cancel the feeling, the brain acts mechanically on this regard, moreover it will be throwing ideas the excuses, so to avoid discomfort by all means. Only systematic repeating of an action backed by rationalization changes it, then the brain gradually gives up and starts acting how it was said to act. Thus, maximum free will is reached and internal moral prejudices are overcome.

Maximum freedom.

Dr. Stockmann (lowering his voice). Hush! You mustn't say anything about it yet; but I have made a great discovery. /Mrs. Stockmann. Another one? /Dr. Stockmann. Yes. (Gathers them round him, and says confidentially:) It is this, let me tell you – that the strongest man in the world is he who stands most alone. (H. Ibsen, "Enemy of the people")

Who has maximum freedom of personality? It might sound paradoxically but, at least for now, the one who is free from personality has the maximum freedom of personality (which doesn't absolutely mean the lack of individuality). The maximum freedom implies the maximum choice, sacrifice of the least number of options. Maximum freedom is often said to be related to money or power, strength. But how much are really free the ones who has it? As for strength, for every strong one, the stronger one can be found or one who's able to neutralize possibilities to use it. Money sure give great abilities but any serious money are related to public activity, by and large connected to exploitation of the collective, be that any big business, show business or blogging activity, respectively the dependence of the collective is also high. Yeah, that person can buy a yacht and

such but, on the other hand, in open can't day a word unchecked – there is always a probability that plebeian resentment would lead to various boycotts, canceling, contracts breaking and other. It's enough to remember the case with a blogger PewDiPie a few years ago when the word nigger that came out during a streaming caused breaking a few contracts with him. The reason here, of course, is not some sort of "cultural marxism" or orders of a secret totalitarian government, but trivial business interests which are based on the collective. However, as soon as the collective is destroyed and herd morality is eliminated, business and an individual will be completely free from this, and market will also be completely free from such a regulation. The truly free market is a market that is free from morality. Maybe state power gives freedom? Actually not, government officials, despite all their privileges, almost 24 hours a day are deep in a routine paper work and don't belong to themselves in fact. Dismissal from such a job is often also impossible or leads to lose of all privileges and sometimes life, too. It's not to mention other aspects of freedom like inability to go down the street without being recognized or stay alone. And, in fact, traditional state will be liquidated in the future and power become more impersonal, anonymous, bordering anarchy, a part of objective material conditions, in some sense a "deep state" will get "deeper". The most free person is, thus, the most autonomous, independent from the collective, the most self-absorbed one. To be maximum free one has to be nobody and at the same time totally self-sufficient, self-contained and powerful, a lot like god. With the only difference is that god is a metaphysical concept, an absolute. For an absolute freedom one has to be god that's out of the world, who's "kingdom is not of this world". Apparently this sort of reasoning leads to the idea like in Dostoevsky's "Demons": *"Each who wants the main freedom should dare to kill oneself*"*. However, I no way promote asceticism or some buddhist-christian bullshit, material goods are worth to be increased anyway, and since there is nothing metaphysical in reality (it is identical to non-existence, to be exact), I shall confine myself to reasoning on maximal freedom. As they say, "infinity is not the limit" (meaning that a function's limit can only approach infinity).

Some lyrics.

The might, after all, is still being the right
The white sure is black and black is all white
Traditions, religion, spiritual shucks
Of this shit I give absolutely no fucks
Screw Motherland, nation, I don't wanna be hero
Moral values are multiplied by zero
Destroy society, load your fucking gun
Ain't parting in anything, don't wanna be anyone
Hail capitalism and hail corporations
We ain't need no humanist decorations
As you are equal you aren't free
Equality is at a cemetery!

Destruction of moral
Going spiral
Complete depravation
Shall be viral
Do what thou wilt
Shall be whole of the law
Let ethicists tremble
In the horror and awe

Сожги на костре мировой революции
Коричневую портянку фекальной отчизны
Дави сапогом свободы
Слюнявчатого червя коммунизма
Искореняй духовность огнём и мечом
Да хоть дилдаком табуретом и клизмой,
Насилуй ватников батоном колбасы
Спали осиное гнездо рашизма
Убей в себе Путина,
Разорви его на буквы и слова,
России быть не должно
Это ясно как дважды два!
Рашка это клерикальный упырь, азиопский Франкенштейн
Раздави гадину, make North Eurasia great again!
Совковый барак озарится лучами свободы
И Мордору настанет конец
Novus Ordo Seclorum!
Chev Gorba Yelts!
Мировая ось зла проходит через Мавзолей,
И вновь поднимаются орды антропоморфных свиней
Борис Николаич в Вальгалле будет рад
Когда на руинах Орды гордо прошествует гей-парад!
Как говорил академик Гайдар, Макдак is the best,
И, таким образом, Rashka delenda est!

Epilogue

This text is a synthesis of the most of the ideas I have accumulated for many years and completes the design of the quite integral philosophical doctrine. Partially, there was used the texts I published in public page and other places in 2018 – 2020. Particular examples and facts that strengthened my point were taken from various sources. I assume the text might possibly be expanded later on if I suddenly remember something important.

December 3rd 2020 – first edition
December 10th 2020 – February 28th 2021 – extra editions
September 14th 2021 – English translation finished
September 24th 2021 – Major update